ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL HAZARDOUS WASTE PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING: TRANSCRIPT

AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE DU CONSEIL DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT SUR LES DECHETS DANGEREUX: COMPTE RENDU

CAMPBELLTON, NEW BRUNSWICK/NOUVEAU-BRUNSWICK

MARCH 14, 1986/LE 14 MARS 1986

Conseil de
l'environnement
du Nouveau-Brunswick: 1986

New Brunswick
Environmental
Council: 1986

INDEX OF SPEAKERS/LISTE DES ORATEURS

MR. ALLEN 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 75, 76, 77

M. L.-P. ARSENAULT 10, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 50, 59

MR. A. BECKINGHAM 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 66, 75

MR. J. BLANCHARD 39, 40, 41, 42

MR. S. CHEDORE 62

M. L.-P. CHOUINARD 74

MR. B. CLARK 70, 71

MR. DOHANEY 67, 68, 69, 70

MR. J. DOUCET 62

MLLE S. GODIN 15, 16, 17, 18, 47, 48

MR. M. HARQUAIL 56, 73

MR. G. HILL 60

MR. J. JOHNSON 49

MR. D. KERR 20, 21, 68, 69, 76, 77

MR. K. LANGMAID 9, 37, 49, 53, 55, 69, 70

M. L. LAPIERRE . . . 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 19, 20, 21, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78

MRS. D. LAPOINTE 60

MR. J. MACMILLAN 2, 3, 21, 35, 36, 37, 38, 51, 52, 71

MR. M. REINHARDT 19, 34, 55, 56, 65, 66, 67, 70

MR. D. SMITH 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 34, 35, 36, 53, 54, 55, 56, 64

MRS. H. TAYLOR 19

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 65

MS. G. WALSH 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 50, 72

LAPIERRE:

On va débuter la dernière séance sur les déchets dangereux et toxiques du Nouveau-Brunswick. Je vous souhaite tous la bienvenue à cette séance, puis au nom des membres du Conseil de l'environnement, c'est notre plaisir d'être ici d'écouter vos commentaires sur votre environnement.

I'll start by presenting the members of the Environmental Council who are here today as a part of a Panel to listen to your concerns and suggestions regarding the management of hazardous, general and controlled wastes for New Brunswick.

To my far right is Ken Langmaid. Ken Langmaid is a soil scientist, now retired and living in St. Andrews, New Brunswick. To my immediate right is Helen Taylor. Helen Taylor is a retired business lady from Doaktown. To my far left is Dave Kerr. Dave Kerr works for Fraser in Edmundston and to my immediate left is Don Smith. Don Smith is from Belledune. Myself, I'm Louis LaPierre. I'm a professor of ecology at the University of Moncton.

To just briefly introduce the topic. As you are no doubt aware, if you have read the literature that was forwarded before the meeting, you know that the province of New Brunswick is undertaking a special review of the waste disposal practices in New Brunswick and wishes to try to implement a new or a safer waste disposal method for future years. This will entail three specific aspects.

The first one is related to domestic waste and as you have found in the literature you will see that we're looking at regional sites for domestic waste. These sites could be a number which might vary from 12 to 15 or so. These would be run under regional commissions and these would greatly reduce the present number of sites which are numbered over 250. So, there's quite a reduction.

The second aspect is the controlled waste aspect. As you know, we produce various types of waste, some of which are more dangerous than others and some of this waste has to be buried with precautions. Some of this controlled waste that we might classify as asbestos, for example, of which most New Brunswickers have heard in the last few months.

The Province proposes a series of a limited number of these sites which would be strategically located throughout the Province depending on the ecological factors that would enable their establishment. These sites might be from three to seven where a more rigid control of waste management would be enforced.

The third type of waste that we have in New Brunswick is toxic or hazardous waste. At the present time, the plans are to have this waste shipped out of Province for disposal either by incineration or other means.

So these are the three main aspects of the waste control program and today we would like to hear your comments regarding these concerns. We have with us some people of the Department of the Environment who would be willing to answer questions and try to give you further information if you so desire.

I think we will follow the following procedures. Some people have indicated that they have formal presentations to bring forth. For those who have formal presentations I have a list of the individuals who have already identified themselves. And for those who do not have formal presentations, or who have yet not identified themselves, the only thing I would ask you to do is once these people have finished it to raise your hands and I will acknowledge as I notice the hands.

So, I would before we start the formal presentations, I'd like to announce that the Environmental Council is composed of 13 members. The Council is an advisory board to the Minister and today we are only five, you only see five members of Council. But, we are 13 members and we represent a cross section of society in New Brunswick. We have here in the hall one other member who is not on the task force here but who is with us today and that's Mr. Leonard Williams. He's from Grand Falls area. So Leonard is in the back.

With this we would now proceed with the first presenter and the first presenter that we have is Gail Walsh from the Chaleur Environmental Protection Association. I would ask Mrs. Walsh to...

MACMILLAN:

Mr. Chairperson, do you have on there the NDP Riding Association and the UFFI Chapter, New Brunswick Action Group?

LAPIERRE:

I do not have the UFFI, I had a name of Mr. MacMillan, would that be the NDP? I do not have the UFFI.

MACMILLAN:

We're combining them.

LAPIERRE:

OK.

WALSH:

Thank you very much. Good afternoon. Before beginning this presentation of our brief, of which we are pleased to have the opportunity to make, I would like essentially to explain what the Chaleur Environmental Protection Association is and perhaps give a brief history of the organization.

CEPA, as it's more commonly known, was founded in the early 1970's as primarily an anti-nuclear group concerned about the possibility of construction of a CANDU reactor on one of four possible sites in northeastern New Brunswick. The group crystallized into a broad-based group of individuals who have a wide variety of backgrounds, political affiliations and positions in the community. In the late 1970's CEPA was awarded the coveted White Owl Award for conservation and utilized the funds as the research arm of the Maritime Energy Coalition.

CEPA's mandate is now the protection of the environment and we have committees concerned with energy, heavy metals, the provincial spray program, town beautification, toxic wastes, and others. For this reason, we want to bring to your attention the problems presented by hazardous wastes in the pulp and paper industry, the CIL chlor-alkali plant in Dalhousie, NB Power's thermal coal generating station, as well as others. I guess our brief would primarily examine the last category of which you spoke, which is toxic wastes.

As one of the most industrialized regions in the province of New Brunswick, it is crucially important that the Environmental Council be aware of the immense amount of waste that is dumped in to the Restigouche River, settles in the sediment, lost in the air, and is placed in controlled, but as often as not, ordinary landfill sites. Undoubtedly, there are many more forms of waste which I'm certain other groups will examine.

Our objective is, by delineating some of the more pointed and unfortunate incidents here, to recommend action towards solving the problem of hazardous wastes in New Brunswick.

It would take too much of your valuable time to outline every single source of potential hazardous waste in this region. So, for the purpose of brevity for this hearing, it'll suffice to note our main industries and sources of toxic waste, the pulp and paper industry, that is the New Brunswick Industrial Paper Company in Dalhousie and Fraser Inc., the CIL Chlor-Alkali plant in Dalhousie, the New Brunswick Power thermal coal generating station in Dalhousie, Allied Chemicals in Dalhousie Junction, and the provincial spray program which uses organophosphates during May, June and the herbicide program using 2,4,5T and 2,4D containing dioxin, a carcinogen and the most dangerous chemical known to humanity.

CEPA has monitored and studied all these sources of pollution and is extremely concerned that those who operate these industries have not necessarily taken the necessary precautions in proper waste disposal. Some examples of our concern which we have made public before and I guess I think we need to look at that again are: first of all the CIL. In 1979, Canadian Industries Limited despite its own admission of a loss of .380 to 1.5 milligrams/kg of mercury lost in the sediment, .38 to .71 milligrams/kg off Dalhousie and from .27 to .62 milligrams/kg in Dalhousie air ambient levels between 189.7 and an alarming 10,855 nanograms/cu metre which is ten times the normal limit, average 2,504.9 nanograms/cu metre. The company claimed there was not danger to the community and no existing problems. In fact at the time they issued such placid remarks at a public meeting in Dalhousie, they were being charged with 14 counts of polluting the Restigouche River, charges on which they were later convicted. The legal issues involved only the water pollution and CIL has not recently made public its losses of mercury, chlorine and caustic soda.

Furthermore, a human health survey conducted around the same time, one done quite unscientifically, it must be noted, on some 50 Dalhousie residents, has never been made public.

Secondly, the spray program, and I refer to the first spray program, that is the one in May and June. Many of you are perhaps unaware that the spruce budworm spray program was begun by the NBIP in 1952 with government funding and extended to the rest of the Province by the government in 1953. Up until 1968, the now banned insecticide DDT was utilized. Although the program appears to be ineffective in killing budworms, though the Province's bird population has decreased by 35%, Restigouche County receives 20% of the total amount of insecticides used over the years. The medical risks of these organophosphates, Fenitrothion is just one example, we've used Matacil and Sevin and others, cannot go unnoticed and unheeded. These chemicals persist in the environment and are a constant sort of toxic waste. In fact, one young St. Moore family became quite alarmed when, in the early 1980's, they watched spray planes fly over their house, the young children became ill and they found higher than normal traces of Fenitrothion in their well water.

The third element I'd like to talk about is arsenic. The third example we would like to note is the presence of arsenic among several citizens in Dalhousie. Extensive studies by two separate medical teams found that from four to seven percent of the population could be diagnosed as having mild to severe forms of poisoning. Both concluded that arsenic came from shellfish. But the original industrial source has never been pinpointed. One of the victims of a clearly diagnosed case of arsenic poisoning was my aunt and arsenic is also known to cause lung cancer. In late December of last year, she died of that illness. I wonder what happened to the other victims of arsenic poisoning?

These are but a few of the illustrations of the serious toxic waste problems facing Restigouche County. There are, indeed, many more. Consequently, our recommendations to the Council are:

1) All industries be mandated by government to utilize controlled waste disposal methods.

2) An extensive non-chemical silviculture process be initiated to eliminate the use of dangerous organo-phosphates and dioxin.

3) Periodic testing of all waste disposal methods be implemented in industry and well water.

4) This information should be made public and process for public participation be started.

5) New Brunswick's environmental legislation be strengthened. We especially implore this Council to recommend to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment that a Clean Water Act be established.

6) New Brunswick should establish a waste management corporation similar to the Ontario model which could centrally control all the categories of landfill sites. I guess perhaps with your regional work that might be evolved into that or perhaps you can do both of those.

7) More investigations should be made into the source of arsenic in Dalhousie, which has never been conclusively found.

8) Finally, we should adopt the American EPA method of managing wastes, including: reducing the generation of hazardous wastes and utilizing waste through exchange, recovery and recycling. And there are several methods for doing that which are documented in several scientific journals and I don't think we have the time to go and list these today.

We believe that if industry, concerned citizens and government work together, many of the serious problems we now face can be overcome. Ursula Franklin, a renowned University of Toronto physicist once asserted that the perceptions of those who care are 15 years ahead of those who don't. I would like to think and let us trust that our Province cares enough to ensure a healthy environment for all of its citizens.

Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much, Mrs. Walsh. I wonder if you would care to stay and maybe answer a few questions.

I might start by looking at the first recommendation that you brought forth which is, you indicate that all industries be mandated by government to utilize controlled waste disposal methods. My question is not directly related to that, but it's in reaction to it. As you know, one of the proposals put forth by the Province is that we have controlled waste sites, where this type of industrial waste might be handled. As you know, we will not have these sites all over the Province. There will be some specific guidelines and criteria. However, once the final criteria and guidelines have been established, specific sites will be isolated. If it so happened that your county had the ideal location, soil sites and conditions, would you be willing to have one of these sites located within your county?

WALSH:

I think the answer would be categorically no. We are one of the most heavily industrialized counties as it is and suffer from one of the highest cancer rates in the Province and I don't really think that we need any other form of pollution that would cause more problems.

LAPIERRE:

OK. I'll ask the second part to that question. If this site was to receive only wastes that you generate in your county or from your industries, would you then be willing to have it located within your boundaries?

WALSH:

If it was in a specific isolated area very far from human habitation.

LAPIERRE:

These areas more likely have as one of their criteria that they not be near human habitation so...

WALSH:

Also, our Association would prefer to see of lot of regulations like government to ensure that these areas are protected and ensure that people do not have access. For example, there was a chemical waste dump found in Robinsonville last year or the year before, I can't remember the exact year, where Tordon and 2,4,D were found in a regular landfill site and that was near human habitation. So, if we go by the history of what the Province has done, I don't think I would like to see that happen. But I think we need to have much more stringent guidelines to operate such a facility.

LAPIERRE:

Well, I think that these guidelines would be included but, as you mentioned throughout your brief, you are concerned that you have pollution problems at different levels at different places. One thing that we need to do, if we're going to control any of these emissions, is to try to localize and isolate. One thing that's going to happen is that we're going to have to have some site where these can be put. Now, if no one wants these chemicals anywhere, then we haven't made much progress.

WALSH:

Well, I guess in the word of Werner Troyer, who has written a book "No Safe Place", there is no safe place.

SMITH:

So would you shut down the industries then?

WALSH:

No. I don't believe we should do that but I think that we, as I say, need more stringent guidelines. I'm not attacking the industries. I'm just saying that we need to have much more stringent and stronger guidelines and that I believe that industry and environmentalists can work together to do this.

LANGMAID:

Might I add a third item to that question. What if you couldn't find a suitable place in this county for your controlled waste disposal? Would you want them to sit here in a area where they weren't perfectly handled? Cause that's what you're saying because if you don't want anybody else's and if they can't find a place or we can't take yours out it's the same thing. We would be exposing you people, when we could put them in a safe place.

WALSH:

Well I guess it's the same problem that is occurring in Maine right now where there are four nuclear disposal sites being argued about in the United States. I think that we as a community, as industrialists and as environmentalists have a responsibility to handle this waste properly. But, I would suggest that we, I'm not saying that other people should look after our wastes but that perhaps there's also another method of dealing with that, and that's at the direct source. I think that some of our industries could use more preventative methods. For example, the NB Power coal generating station could introduce a scrubber and that type of thing, which might eliminate. That's what I suggest here in reducing the generation of hazardous waste. There are several ways to deal with hazardous waste so that we can eliminate the amount that we have. I'm not suggesting that we shut down industry, I'm suggesting that we find ways of dealing with it. I don't know if that answers your question.

LANGMAID:

We're speaking of the controlled waste now that we're going to have to have a place to put them in the Province. Now these will be very strictly controlled and legislated. The hazardous waste that's a different matter again. We have to have special incinerators and whatnot to get rid of them.

LAPIERRE:

I'd like to come back Mrs. Walsh to hazardous waste or the toxic component of waste which I think is referred to in your brief. The present method that is proposed by the Province for toxic waste or hazardous waste would be to have it sent outside of the Province for incineration or destruction. Do you have any problems with that? Or would you rather have it, you mentioned

that it maybe could be destroyed at source. This will entail transportation of this waste.

WALSH:

I realize that would pose another problem but I would prefer the method of taking it out of the Province as our provincial Department has suggested or enunciated. But I do think that we have to look at every proposal and not just one.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Well I guess we'll thank you Mrs. Walsh and we'll pass on to our next presenter. If you have any further questions, please feel free to intervene.

WALSH:

Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

La prochaine personne qui a demandé la parole c'est M. Léo-Paul Arsenault. Est ce que M. Arsenault est ici?

ARSENAULT:

Peut-être pour essayer de mettre un peu de couleur j'ai emmené la carte qui est derrière vous puis peut-être qu'on pourrait se situer avec tout ça, c'est que on est sur la pointe supposée la plus elevée du Nouveau-Brunswick. Je ne sais pas mais...je pense que tout le monde se connait.

Mr. Chairman I found a poem by Robert Frost and I thought it was quite proper. He says:

> The woods are lovely. Dark and deep. And I have a promise to keep. And miles to go before I sleep and miles to go before I sleep.

I thought it was proper Mr. Chairman. And then the next notation is taxation without representation is a tyranny and I'm quite proud that you people are here today rather than for us to travel to some other community.

On page 2 Mr. Chairman is just the press release that your office circulated and on page 3, I'm here today as a tax payer and on my own behalf.

Having lived in Restigouche County for all of my 45 years, I have seen many changes in hazardous waste management and have taken a very active role in community affairs. I sit on the Board of School Trustees, School District 36 and I am the Director of the Dalhousie Emergency Organization for the past 8 years and a full-time representative of the Canadian Union of Public Employees for the past 25 years.

Our federal government has, through Canatek, our official emergency agency in Canada adopted the United Nations standard identification system and Canada now has designated some 9,185 hazardous products divided into nine classes. They identify anything from acetone to, I can't even pronounce this one Mr. Chairman, which represents that last one in the book.

Our local dumps receive any amount of these 9,185 products on a sporadic time element, in other words not all at the same time, and our dump management personnel is by far unqualified to react vis a vis these hazardous products. The rule of thumb is that the dump management is conveyed, tendered or contracted to the lowest bidder. Therefore, knowledge and training of the dump attendant on the site is next to nothing.

I would like to echo and support the presentation made to your committee in the City of Bathurst made by Mr. Richard Playfair where he said, "our firefighters are putting their lives in danger every time they respond to a call". How true. I want to challenge you, Mr. Chairman and the members of your Environmental Council, to cause a study on the formal education and/or training obtained by our dump attendants, not excluding industrial accidents under the Workman's Compensation Act and/or outpatient hospital services. I am confident that your Environmental Council will be surprised with its findings.

Let's not forget also our pollutants, chicken and hog farmers in this county and with this, Mr. Chairman, I have included, after the last page a memoire qui a été présenté par le Dr Médard Bérubé, celui qui est responsable pour la santé publique de ce coin-ci du pays et son mémoire fait allusion à plusieurs points salients qui méritent d'être lus et relus. Ce n'est pas nécessaire, je pense, qu'on fouille là-dedans, M. le Président, mais j'espère

que si je peux le porter à votre attention et que l'effort désiré soit appliqué. Pour venir de nouveau à page 4.

In the manual that was circulated, the Environmental Impact Assessment process is designated to consolidate and evaluate information concerning biophysical and socio-economic impacts caused by major developers or developments. The sites and methods used for solid waste disposal often require a detailed review of environmental concerns. These guidelines are presented to assist proponents in preparing Environmental Impact Assessment reports for the proposed landfills. And here's the punch line Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that these guidelines do not apply to landfills to receive hazardous wastes.

Below that it is the intention of Environment New Brunswick not to license proposed landfills to receive hazardous wastes. A step in the right direction.

Now my proposal is that the Department of Municipal Affairs should erect incinerators to accommodate such hazardous wastes. How? The New Brunswick International Paper Company, CIP, in Dalhousie recently conducted tests for NB Hydro in destroying the PCB's and the media covered the story. It was found, according to NB Hydro spokesperson, Mr. Ellingham, that it cost $10 to destroy one gallon of PCB. I recommend that incinerators be erected at 100 mile intervals in New Brunswick or that our present hydro plants, and that is steam plants, be converted to accommodate what can be handled and that the federal government enact or have available an incinerator on a national level to receive what the Province could not burn or destroy according to the established norms. The incinerators, in turn, could be constructed in a manner to generate electricity. Yes, I see the Board members raising.....

In the February 3 or 5th issue of the Telegraph Journal there is quite a spread by a confrère of yours from Boise Cascade who is advancing the possibility of converting, around the Perth Andover area, some kind of electrical generating system through an incinerator.

Then, Mr. Chairman, how would this be fueled, this incinerator? Our forest management is not part of this study however, with fuel chips. These incinerators could be adequately fed and our forests would be well kept, free of disease and occupy our unemployed. There are presently several studies being conducted in

Restigouche County on this matter and I do not have copies to make available and I understand they are still in the planning stages. They are not in circulation as yet.

Then I have added the, as proposed or circulated by your Department what I could find. The reason why I included it is because the Department says that these are minimums. I was shocked to see the first one was dry cleaners. A few years ago, we did a survey and the survey indicated that there was a firm from outside the Province that came and picked up the residues. However, a few weeks ago, through the local press, I learned this material, these solvents were now flushed in our sewer system.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I have included the March 1982 report and on page 22 of this document, I fully endorse the recommendations therein contained and I've added two of them...number 13 and number 14. Number 13 is the immediate construction of incinerators at 100 mile intervals and number 14, that our community colleges offer courses on hazardous waste management for civic servants. And then next to that, Mr. Chairman, is the Dr. Médard Bérubé's brief.

I want to thank you very much, if we go to the very last page. Mr. Chairman and members of Council, please consider this as my written presentation along with the verbal explanation. It has been an honour and a privilege to address this Council today and that the Council did take time to offer us, the residents of Restigouche, an opportunity to air our concerns which I hope will be to everyone's advantage. I'm open, Mr. Chairman, to questions.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Thanks a lot. Merci beaucoup, M. Arsenault. Il y aura probablement quelques questions. J'aimerais si c'est possible si vous pourriez placer le micro un peu plus en avant de vous, parce qu'on fait compétition avec un bruit à côte. Je ne sais pas trop ce que c'est, mais il y a quelque chose qui va pas bien.

Alors, je ne sais s'il y en a qui ont des question. M. Smith, oui?

SMITH:

The incinerators, are we talking about PCB incinerators or just regular domestic waste incinerators?

ARSENAULT:

I would hope Mr. Chairman that these incinerators would be constructed in such a way that it will handle all of our hazardous materials and what these incinerators cannot handle that they would be passed on to some federal agency or some federal concern in the meantime.

SMITH:

Are you specifically talking about incinerators, say for domestic waste?

ARSENAULT:

Yes.

SMITH:

You are enthusiastic about that as opposed to landfills?

ARSENAULT:

Definitely, and the reason why, Mr. Chairman, is that all studies indicate that a ton of waste or garbage is equivalent to 1.1 barrels of oil and knowing that the oil is going down I understand that too. But there's God knows how many tons of waste garbage that's been dumped every day and we have a prime example when they built the by-pass here, they had to deviate from the original plans in order to circumvent an old dump that was buried over. With some incinerators like they have in Europe, at least we could have our roads straight.

SMITH:

OK. What I was after was that the PCB, the wonderful PCB problem is, of course, in a different category than the simple household waste. It's a different machine, many many millions of dollars of construction costs.

ARSENAULT:

Well, according to NB Hydro spokesperson they've done that in Dalhousie within the last two or three weeks and...

SMITH:

That's an interesting question. That came up last night. There is a difference between askarel transformers or askarel-filled transformers and askarel-contaminated transformers. I was given the impression that the Dalhousie situation was involved with a level less than 400 parts per million. Are you aware of that?

ARSENAULT:

No, Mr. Chairman, I'm not familiar with the ratings.

SMITH:

In other words the askarel transformers that we were putting in place 20 years ago were 75%, 750,000 parts per million PCB. The contamination that we're talking about at Dalhousie, as I given to believe, was like 250 parts per million. It's a different situation altogether. I don't know if there's anybody here from Environment New Brunswick who can speak on that, but there's a very definite, there are two definite categories here altogether from 75% to less than one percent. Could somebody from Environment New Brunswick speak on this?

GODIN:

The transformer in Dalhousie that was decontaminated in December was a mineral oil-filled transformer that had low level PCB contamination. The problem is of a totally different magnitude when you're talking contaminated PCB transformers and PCB-filled or askarel-filled. Another way of putting it in the proper perspective is, and I saw these figures yesterday and I'll try to remember them as closely as I saw them yesterday, it's if you take a 45 gallon drum of PCB or typical askarel solution you would have in a 45 gallon drum approximately 450 pounds of PCB's. In a 45 gallon drum of mineral oil, which has low level contamination of PCB similar to what you would have in the Dalhousie transformer, you would have between one and two ounces of PCB's. That allows the PCB contaminated mineral oil to be treated chemically as opposed to being incinerated and destroyed as you need to do with pure PCB's.

The treatment is totally different and the cost of treatment is totally different. The low-level PCB's can be decontaminated chemically by a fairly simple process. It's been done in the States, it's been done in most of the provinces in Canada on an experimental basis. Some of the hydro companies in other provinces are buying or purchasing their own decontamination equipment so that they can treat and decontaminate the mineral oil-filled transformers and these projects are on-going or just on the point of starting.

The low-level oil is also a type of oil which can be incinerated and that might be what M. Arsenault is alluding to. Low-level contaminated oil can be incinerated in the type of boiler as you would find in a coal-fired power plant or a cement kiln. Various industrial boilers, probably the types of boilers that you would find in the Belledune smelter, where the temperature is sufficient to burn low level, and again the difference that allows the incineration to proceed for the low level in these cases is again the nature of the PCB's is such that it is not flammable. It does not burn. If it does not burn at sufficiently high temperatures and it does not stay in the flame for a sufficient length of time, the PCB is not destroyed. It does not burn and it kills the flame and it's extremely difficult to burn, therefore necessitating incinerators that are specifically built to maintain the temperature and destroy the PCB's. Low level contaminated oils can be burned in incinerators which do not meet the specifications required for destruction of high level oil.

SMITH:

I'm not sure about your statement about the smelter burning.

GODIN:

I would say that technically, that is feasible. It is not being done in New Brunswick.

SMITH:

Do you suppose anybody realizes why PCB's were invented in the first place? Oil-filled transformers are a fire hazard and if you have an oil-filled transformer on a hydro pole, nobody cares when it burns. But in fact, when it's in the basement in the hospital then people get quite emotional about it, so PCB's in fact were, I believe, their reasons for existence was they were fire resistant, right?

GODIN:

PCB's were invented for a good cause and used extensively in industry before the environmental hazards were fully understood.

SMITH:

PCB's were only used because they wanted to avoid a fire hazard.

GODIN:

(tape inaudible) avoid arcing which would then cause fires in electrical equipment.

SMITH:

Right, so they were created, the good points, if you will were simply that they were fire retardant. Now we're trying to get rid of the darn things and we can't burn them.

GODIN:

That is the reason that they are so technically difficult to destroy, yes.

SMITH:

But as far as the chemical treatment, I believe the figure of 400 parts per million was the practical limit of...

GODIN:

The chemical destruction of PCB's can be done on contaminated oils. The levels can be higher than 400 ppm. They can go, I've seen in literature, 2,000, 4,000 ppm. But there is a limit where the chemical reaction cannot..

SMITH:

Is it not dollars?

GODIN:

Pardon me?

SMITH:

Is it not dollars? In other words, at 75% PCB, it's not practical to do it by that chemical process, it's better to burn it.

GODIN:

It would not be practical economically and it would probably not be terribly safe because of the volume of sodium which you would need to proceed with the reaction.

SMITH:

Does that, maybe, cover a broader scope of what we were talking about earlier?

ARSENAULT:

Well, I'm willing to admit, Mr. Chairman, that I'm no expert in so many parts per million and so on. However, where every indication is there that at least some people are trying to do something, why don't we encourage these individuals who are trying to do something with the mess and if incinerators are the answer, by gosh, let's build them.

SMITH:

The incinerators you were talking about were for the kitchen wastes, domestic?

ARSENAULT:

And fire wood residue.

SMITH:

Pardon?

ARSENAULT:

Yes, kitchen waste residue and firewood residue, forest residue.

SMITH:

Right. OK. Thank you.

TAYLOR:

I was wondering while Simone was up there, if she would perhaps refer to a statement in Mr. Arsenault's presentation and with the new dump sites proposed both domestic and controlled for the Province. Is there a program going to be initiated to train attendants to handle these? Perhaps it would be Mr. Reinhardt that would be the best person to answer that.

REINHARDT:

My name is Mike Reinhardt from the Department of the Environment. I'm the solid waste engineer, commonly known as the Garbage Man, or something like that.

Last year sometime, we came up with the idea to train dump attendants and I thought about this for a while and there's quite a disparity between the sizes of operations and the type of attendants and type of operations. I've put off the idea of a regular scheduled training session, but will go on an individual basis for a time and at the moment even though this appears to be maybe the logical way, when you realize the diversity between sites, diversity between maybe even understanding of the operators, you realize that this even though generally speaking it seems to be a reasonable idea, when in its application, it's not quite the same thing.

If I may in the same breath, say something similar applies to sometimes, incinerators. If incinerators are great things if you have your public willing to spend maybe up to $200 or $300 per capita to get them in place, there's nothing wrong with them. Very good.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Thanks a lot Mr. Reinhardt. Avez vous d'autres commentaires?

ARSENAULT:

Non, excepté de dire M. le Président que la Loi, je sais qu'on est pas ici pour faire des propositions ou des amendements comme telles, mais il devrait avoir quelque chose dans la Loi où que nous comme citoyens pouvons questionner certaines actions faites par différentes agences.

Et en lisant la Loi, on peut voir très plairement que c'est un peu comme le gouvernement de Sud l'Afrique. Il y a seulement que le Ministre qui peut prendre une action et non les individus comme moi et vous. Ce fait si qu'il y a aucun moyen, M. Président, je l'ai pas mis dans mon brief mais je suggèrerais qu'il y ait quelque sorte de commentaire de fait que nous le citoyen, qu'on aurait le droit de déposer un plainte quelconque soit devant la Cour provinciale ou fédérale.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Merci beaucoup M. Arsenault. Puis on prendra le temps de lire votre rapport, votre presentation avec...M. Arsenault, il y a un autre question. Pourriez-vous prendre le micro.

KERR:

It's not a question, it's just a statement. You say there's no way that a private citizen can complain to the Department of the Environment. I have noticed over the past, at least, 20 years that in New Brunswick that if someone writes a letter to a newspaper, you get some action from the Department of the Environment. It's as simple as that. If they'll print your letter and almost invariably they do, if it's properly written, you will get an investigation by the Department of the Environment in Fredericton. They respond very quickly to that type of pressure.

ARSENAULT:

But, as a citizen, you cannot as an individual take action against company A or Company B or government A or government B. The only person that can take this action is the Minister. And you can investigate things until hell freezes over, that doesn't mean anything. It's only paying lip service to the problem. If you do not have a Minister who is willing to take the issue at hand, what do you have? You have a group of poor civil servants who are trying to do something and the buck stops there. It doesn't go anywhere. I was shocked a few years ago when the government finally decided to take action against CIL. It's just unbelievable. You have to have Mr. Minister's signature before you can do anything. And that's not right.

KERR:

I'm sorry, I didn't realize you were talking about prosecutions. I thought you were talking about actions by the Ministry of Environment.

LAPIERRE:

OK, merci beaucoup. I would now proceed on to the third speaker. The third speaker on the list I have Mr. MacMillan and the NDP and ah...there's two groups. I would just like to say that while they are moving their books and getting into place, I would just like to remind you that if anyone of you need coffee during the presentations, you're welcome to go to the back of the hall and pick up the coffee that you need and come back. We won't be taking any formal break.

So, Mr. MacMillan, if you're ready.

MACMILLAN:

Mr. Chairperson and members of the Panel, I am President of the Campbellton-Atholville-Tide Head NDP Association and also since early 1983, I've been President of the local chapter in this area, covering Campbellton/Dalhousie area, for the N.B. Action Group incorporated, non-profit organization made up of homeowners who had their homes insulated with UFFI. With me today on the presentation is Jim Doucet from Dalhousie area. He's the Vice President of our UFFI chapter and also a mill worker.

We have here today, Mr. Chairman, in the audience some home owners who still have UFFI in this area in their homes and others who have had it removed. There are some who got government grants and others who did not. They were too late and didn't get any assistance at all from the government.

Greetings. The Campbellton-Atholville-Tide Head New Democratic Riding Association was concerned when Restigouche county, Campbellton, was not included in the schedule of meetings announced by Mr. Robert Jackson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment where hearing would be held. A protest was sent to the Minister on January 17, 1986 and a reply was received from the Minister on February 5 and the copies are attached to the brief.

We welcome you to Campbellton and Restigouche and wish to advise you that this NDP Riding Association, along with the Dalhousie and Restigouche Riding Associations have a history of taking a key interest in matters related to the environment. In early 1983, we were deeply concerned by the reckless dumping of garbage as landfill on the Campbellton waterfront. At that time, telegrams were sent to the provincial Minister of the Environment, the Honorable C.W. Harmer and also to the Honorable John Roberts, with the former government, Minister of Environment for Canada. Copies are included here of that correspondence.

Our efforts to obtain some concrete action on the complaint forwarded to both governments became very frustrating. In the letter of March 8, 1983 from Honorable C.W. Harmer, he advised us that a meeting would be held between the parties in Campbellton. Such a meeting did take place in Campbellton and about the only thing learned at that meeting was that no one knew where the federal jurisdiction ended and the provincial jurisdiction commenced on the waterfront. To our great surprise after all the money that was spent in developing that area, there was a disagreement between the provincial government and the federal government as to where their jurisdiction commenced on which side of the bridge, east or west.

To put it bluntly, our complaint regarding the dumping of garbage as part of the landfill was totally ignored. Today our requests, made at that time, are still valid. And one only has to be in the city centre shopping and hotel area during wet weather to see that four to six inches of rain is contained in some areas caused by the dropping of the surface. We again request that this task force take under consideration our concerns and requests made in 1983. We say, Mr. Chairperson, that they are as valid today, probably more valid because of the chemicals and material that have been dumped in there are probably fermented now with other materials that are in there and heavens knows what's there.

I learned within the last 24 hours and I was sorry that I was unable to get a copy but I probably will later, that the waterfront site in the early days of removal of UFFI, that UFFI was dumped in that area.

Today, where does the sewage from the area that the Riding Association covers go? Well, from Andrews St. East, the over 12 million and then some storage treatment plant does operate but from all outer areas of the city, raw sewage still flows into the Restigouche.

Can you imagine the building of such a plant without taking the necessary action as to where the sludge would be deposited? Here's another example of millions of dollars being spent by all three governments, yet no one ever thought that some day there might be some sludge and you might have to put that somewhere. That was the situation and until some arrangement was worked out with the New Brunswick Electric Power Commission for a temporary location to deposit the sludge, raw sewage flowed in the Restigouche. Now three years since we first complained about waste disposal we have a proposed long-range plan for regional solid waste commissions, states the Honorable Robert C. Jackson. I suppose we can say better late than never.

It is interesting that Campbellton City Council will not be represented here at the hearing. I understand that they are all out of town but one.

Today the people of Canada are faced with a railway system that has a difficult time to stay on the rails. We are faced here in Campbellton with chemicals going through here on an average of probably two or three trains in every 24 hours. Some day, we pray it will not happen, we could have a derailment here which would be a disaster. And just to illustrate how little consideration is given to these matters, the Unemployment Insurance and Employment offices were on Rosebury Street in the Post Office Building here since I guess they opened those offices here in Campbellton.

Recently, a consulting firm that's associated with the building of the hospital here was able to buy the building where this business went out of business, sold out. They then entered into a ten year leasing arrangement with the federal government at $130,000 a year and then they remodelled the building and then they moved the employees of Manpower and the Unemployment Office off of Rosebury Street and put them just below the track. They're the closest building to the track today. If ever there is a derailment in that area, everybody should pray for the people of Campbellton. It'll be a disaster of a terrible magnitude.

Freight trains move through the heart of our city, transporting every type of chemical that if an accident occurred in the city would cause hundreds of thousands of dollars damage to property, but the most serious of all would be the deaths and the moving of hundreds of our citizens.

Recently a tanker car while on the railway siding near the CNR Station in Campbellton leaked every ounce of sulfuric acid it contained. We had been told that the spill leaked into the ground and the question we want answered, where did it go from there?

A copy of the letter to the editor of January 11, 1986 is included. The sulfuric acid, we were told, was designated for the CIL plant in Dalhousie, New Brunswick. Where is the waste from this plant stored or deposited? If this company fails to appear and assure the public and this Committee that the procedures followed are within the guidelines for such an operation, then this Committee should tour the plant in order to see, firsthand, what environmental protection procedures are in place.

The same applies to the paper mills: Fraser Inc. in Atholville and New Brunswick International Paper Forest Products Incorporated, Dalhousie. Maybe Mr. Doucet may have something to say, he works in that plant as a long-time employee. The old transformers at the Dalhousie paper mill with PCB's, where have they been stored or buried? Mr. Clarence Girouard of Charlo used to pick up sludge at the mill. Where was it dumped?

The New Brunswick Electric Power Commission has a plant in Dalhousie. What are the emission standards? Where is the waste stored or buried? Could it be that the dump in and around Dalhousie and Charlo contain waste from this generating power facility? Where do we find the environment standards that cover power generating plants, including Point Lepreau nuclear plant that at the present time has a leaky tube giving off radiation?

These are major concerns which we had brought to the attention of both federal and provincial departments earlier, some three years ago. We found it very frustrating in trying to deal with these matters. Probably it's a new era now, because there's more concern everywhere across the world regarding standards that should be put in place in order to see that we have a clean environment.

I want to talk about Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation better known as UFFI. If ever there was a shining example of how governments get manipulated into supporting so-called companies that are set up overnight, it was the hoisting on the people of Canada of UFFI.

At that particular time, even getting the government to give grants to people to use the materials, when they knew very well that the effects of this material was going to have a terrible consequences on the people who would have it in their homes. We have examples of a young family here who bought a house in Campbellton, Mr. Edward Chaisson who lives at 78 Duncan Street with his small family. He has a home which he wasn't able to register because he didn't own it at that time which has formaldehyde in it. His children have all the symptoms that all the other children have. They have the bleeding noses, the sore throats continually.

I had a neighbour who lived next to my home on Wellington Street where he was sitting in the evening with his family and two young children of just before school age and all of a sudden they'd have temperatures of 102°. They were constantly, week in and week out, going to the outpatient department. That has been removed from their home today and they have no ill effects whatsoever. There's conclusive proof.

We have Mr. Kelly Murray who lives at 38 Landsdowne Street who know has a job with the Canadian Union of Public Employees as a representative working out of Saint John, New Brunswick. His family is here, he's in Saint John. He can't even get enough money for the house to sell it to go to somebody to get another mortgage. He is living in Saint John and his family is here in Campbellton. So we have documented proof of the effects of this and, you know, we have 5,550 homes in this Province that were insulated. In the last report you have 492 wells, I think, contaminated. Well there are 5,550 homes in this Province that are contaminated and every dump in this Province, be it municipal or private has got UFFI in it. The UFFI was dumped there. In most cases, the UFFI would have to be bagged and taken to a dump and then the wood associated with that had to be taken in another area to another dump. Both couldn't be combined in the same dump.

Over 5,500 homes in New Brunswick were insulated with UFFI and today in excess of 500 still have the installation. How did such an unacceptable product get federal government approval in the first place? For the information of this Committee attached to this brief is a special expert from Formaldehyde on Trial by the author Lloyd Tatteran: The politics of health in the chemical society presented by the Canadian consumer. Those of us who had our homes insulated know first hand the adverse medical problems associated with UFFI.

I can testify, and so can my wife, regarding asthmatic conditions, nose bleeding, sore throat, all of these problems existed in our home as far as our health was concerned prior to getting UFFI out. Since it's been removed, of course, many of these problems have disappeared.

Those of us who had our homes insulated know first hand of the ill effects associated with UFFI. There are a number of homes in Restigouche that still have UFFI and because the present federal government is closing down the removal program, are unable to have it removed.

I hate to be too negative in making this presentation, but one has to be factual and face the facts. We had a non-profit organization called the N.B. Action Group Inc. During an election period, the government of New Brunswick was prepared to give us a grant to keep that office open. Eighteen months after the election we couldn't get five cents out of them. And we through our pressure brought in over $2.5 million over and above the grants that were given in NEED grants and other types of grants from the federal government, and yet from the provincial government in this Province, we couldn't get the snap of the finger to keep that office open in Moncton to see that we could carry on the program of having UFFI removed. Unless government is going to take a serious look at this. You know, we've had task forces in this country, provincial and political, be it NDP, Tories or Liberals or who ever set them up. If they all stood together from Sydney to Vancouver and cross their hands like this they could sing Auld Lang Syne.

We're getting quite skeptical about what is happening. Downstairs they're rolling the ball, up here we're probably passing the buck.

Many cannot have it removed because of financial reasons. So they have these same medical problems other families had to cope with before removal. There are many homeowners who cannot even sell their property even if UFFI has been removed. We know, we have families in our Chapter who try to sell their property and can't sell it. Couldn't sell it for half the price of its assessed value. That is a difficulty because if you're required by law now, if you had UFFI in your home or you still have it in your home, before you sell that property you must state in that sale that it has been removed or it is still present in the house.

There's a case in Ontario where a homeowner failed to notify the purchaser. The purchaser took the homeowner to court and the cost of removing the UFFI was $13,800 and the homeowner had to pay the total shot, the one who sold the property. From the 5,000 homes that had UFFI removed, where is it stored? Is it stored in municipal dumps and privately operated landfilled areas? Most of the UFFI that was removed from homes in this area is now in a private dump belonging to Mr. Raymond Savoy in the Dalhousie/Charlo area. What will the effects be of such storing of UFFI in dumps because of its cancer-causing, proven in mice?

Will communities in the year 2,000 have to deal with the medical problems because the proper precautions and environmental consideration was not in place during the removal of the 80's? We are very concerned about that.

What about the workers who are involved in the removal of UFFI? Although many received one month's training in removal of UFFI, being supplied mask, coveralls and gloves, failed in some cases to adhere to the removal standards. The main criteria was were you unemployed? Put the unemployed person in there. We recommend that every worker who was involved in the removal program be required to take a medical examination every two years and also provide a resume of where he worked and for what length of time. We could have a situation here in another decade similar to what we saw in the Province here with the workers who worked for NB Power spraying Agent Orange or whatever it was on the transmission lines.

We recommend the medical records be compiled either by the Environment Minister or the Minister of Health. That every location where UFFI and the associated wood products were stored or dumped be examined and that the Minister of Environment take whatever remedial action is necessary to protect the health of the public, with the cost, even if it is in the millions, be borne by the culprit, the federal government, having allowed the product to be used as insulation during the so-called energy oil crises in the 70's. That through the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment, the provincial government demand that the federal government continue the financial assistance program to homeowners, so that not one remaining home in the Province will have UFFI.

We maintain, in our New Brunswick Action Group, that a home with UFFI is equal to a well, contaminated. There's no difference. At least if it's a well, there's another method of getting water. You can go and lug it by the bucket from somewhere else, or by the barrel or get it piped in. But if you have UFFI in your home, UFFI stays there for all time to come.

The federal government at the present time is discontinuing the program, winding it down. We have a member of our chapter here today who when they should be enjoying old age, failed to register and because of the injury that was caused in health in the home, had to go forward and have it removed at a cost of about $11,000-$12,000. Every last nickel they had in savings had to be used.

We appeal to the federal government that they give special consideration to one or two families in this area under these circumstances. We went through our federal Member of Parliament and I may say that our federal Member did what he could do. He did go to the Environment Department. He did go to the Prime Minister. We sent hundreds of letters to the Prime Minister regarding support from people in the neighbourhood supporting our actions here. We sent them to the Premier of New Brunswick, who did reply. The Prime Minister of Canada failed to reply to the letters that were sent to him requesting that these people be given another opportunity. Those that have not registered, that the registration be open for another 60 day period and that these people that own these homes be given an opportunity to apply and get the same grants and those that had taken it out, allow them to register and compensate them at least the same as the other homeowners who had UFFI removed.

If the provincial government of New Brunswick, according to the Deputy Minister, Pierre Marquis, as told to the Accounts Committee recently, has an agreement with Ottawa to impose environmental guidelines on such projects as the storing of PCB's and asbestos at Renous may be bold enough to ask - what environmental guidelines were in place in the Province by agreement with Ottawa as to the containing and disposal of UFFI? We never heard tell of any.

In the news for some time has been the problem of the residents of Fairvale, New Brunswick. This contamination of well water is inexcusable. We have a same situation that went on in Dalhousie, in Warner Troyer's book, "Not a Safe Place" if you look on page 173 you'll see where he quotes, "in that we don't know, we will never know whether these were illnesses, deaths or spontaneous abortions or the other results of mercury poisoning in Shawinigan or Dalhousie". Right next door to us here. Or in your community.

The people in Dalhousie could never find out. They were tested. But the people there to this day, no matter how many times they asked for the results of the tests, have not received them to this day.

The failure of the provincial government to immediately, in conjunction with the municipal council in Fairvale, to undertake a safe water supply system leaves much to be desired as to the willingness of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment to come to grips with such a serious problem. Lack of drinking water, water to bathe and above all water to continue clean sanitary conditions within the home. Communities in the Province have had water contamination by benzene and petroleum, this is all history today.

The Annual Report of the Department 1983/83 shows that there were 294 complaints; 84/85, 493. We're saying to you today that we're giving you another 500 with UFFI, complaints that are in this Province. Many of these people are senior citizens who cannot afford to take that last $6,000 or $7,000 that they have in the bank and take it out. They are embarrassed when you go to their homes, privately and discuss with you and they tell you, they had to tell you privately that their financial situation is that they could not even take it out when the grants were available.

We say that in this Chapter and in our N.B. organization the responsibility is the federal government's to see that that's removed from the homes and that everyone is compensated. They are the ones that conned them into doing it by making offers of grants at that particular time when they knew full well that exactly what they were doing to the public.

If the government does not have the will or the necessary legislation in place to tackle a small laundry. Here we have a situation in New Brunswick where a small laundry is taking on the government. An order was issued, now they're going to go to court.

Well, we who have been around the labour movement most of our lives, know what the courts do and how long it takes to get through them. By the time you get through two or three tiers, you know, you're probably old and decrepit like I am Jim. If the government does not have the will or the necessary legislation in place to tackle a small laundry, firm, then how are we to have any faith in government if the time comes to require large corporations to take corrective measures when they fail to protect the environment?

We have pictures here, in part of this brief here you'll see the landfill project on the waterfront. We are saying to you that there should be tests made there. It is on the Restigouche, believe it or not. And it is a valuable piece of... and we don't know what's going on on the other side of the river. So there is a need here to have a look, and I'm sure that the firm (tape inaudible) who are now the consultants, will know because they were the consultants here when most of it was dumped, so they shouldn't have too much trouble to find out where it is.

We have included in here, while I'm on formaldehyde, on page 2 of "Corrective Measures Removal", you will see here what they are talking about in regards to the removal and this is the most serious part of this because many of the young men, even though the contractors were diligent enough, there were people working on these projects that did not use the masks and other protection that was offered to them and given to them during that time. And that's why were are concerned about the health of these people, these workers who are still in the community.

We have a number of recommendations that we would like to make in regards to what we think should take place:

1) A complete examination of all landfill sites and areas where garbage has been used as landfill, including borings, with the locations designated on the provincial map. Now somebody is going to start telling us that that is too costly, then we are wasting our time in here.

2) The necessary legislation with penalties for the dumping of liquid wastes in other than provincially-designated areas, such areas to be advertised before being designated so that persons and organizations may have the opportunity to become part of the decision-making process. I think number 2 is very important. Unless the people in the community and in the small municipalities and interested organizations are given a voice in selecting places where you would dispose of PCB's and whatever else, I think we'll have the same problem over and over again.

3) An immediate enacting of legislation to be known as the Safe Drinking Water Act with stiff penalties for violations.

4) An end to chemical spraying where health of the population could be in danger. Where chemicals are used in spraying such as the killing of potato weeds and bugs, the package should inform the customer as to the type of chemical used. I do a little bit of cooking at home and I'm good at peeling potatoes and I'm coming to find out seriously that there must be a lot of chemicals used in that potato industry because you'll find today growths, areas of the potato that's decaying which you never saw ten or 15 years ago and I was able to purchase or was given a couple of bushels of potatoes from my daughter who has a small place outside of Saint John on the Bay of Fundy and I can tell you there was no decay on those and there was no chemicals used in the growing of or the destroying of the weeds or the bugs in that small garden that they had in that area.

5) Large municipal areas and provincial governments, through the Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment, should hire the necessary qualified engineering staff to plan and develop incinerators that will dispose of waste material. The possibility that such incinerators could supply energy for government and public consumption should become an integral part of any study.

When I was a municipal employee in the city of Saint John there was such an incinerator in place at that time and they went to the landfill system and that incinerator went out of business. I understand, I'm not too familiar with it, but I understand in Charlottetown the new hospital that was built in Charlottetown there was an incinerator there which is handling waste material, burning waste material, and it's supplying energy to that institution in Charlottetown.

6) There must be a decision made between domestic garbage and the industrial waste. Industry must be required to pay its fair share of the cost of the disposal of industrial waste.

7) The provincial government departments and Crown corporations or agencies must show an example to the public and industry in the disposal of waste material.

8) Our highways and those who travel them must be protected from transportation of hazardous material by instituting legislation, regulations and penalties for those who ignore the damage that can be caused to the health of the public and the environment.

9) The contracting out to multi-national garbage collection companies of the collection service or the land disposal area must never be undertaken by municipalities and provincial governments. I have a book here that was commissioned by the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Mr. Harold Crooks, who was an investigative reporter. I thought I would have copies for each member of the Panel, but apparently they haven't arrived yet. But I'll leave this with you and it's the inside story of the new garbage corporations, large corporations that have been developed in the United States and have come across the border and have been getting to most of the politicians around Ontario and Montreal as a shining example. They've taken over the disposal areas and the contracting. We'll leave a copy with the Chairperson.

Time may yet be on the side of our government in tackling this massive problem of waste disposal and the damage that has already been inflicted on the citizens and the environment. If the provincial government of New Brunswick is serious, millions of dollars will be designated for study, action and in the end, controlled waste management. Time will tell us if all the hearings such as we are participating in today have been anything but political maneuvering.

Thanks for the opportunity to make this presentation on behalf of the Campbellton-Atholville-Tide Head New Democratic Association and our UFFI Chapter here in Campbellton, Dalhousie and area. We would like for you to, maybe some of these you have already read some of these documents you have attached to the brief. To us, we have a map at that very back of the brief showing the disposal system in the city of Campbellton. About 1/3 of the sewage goes through the plant, the rest as you'll see with two red arrows, goes into the Restigouche. Now that type of planning in any community, and I'm not here singling out the city of Campbellton for any whipping, that will take place on May 12. But the governments that encourage the city of Campbellton to get involved in such a debt and then fail to come to the rescue of 9,000 people who now have a debt of $17 million to pay, I think here is where the government, the federal and provincial governments, are leaving the municipal governments holding the bag when it comes to municipal waste disposal. It's got to be played by three parties, not just the municipal government. Saying to them, "OK, you put a pipeline in and give the people water. We're just going to prosecute somebody, that's all we need to do. We'll handle that." That's not enough and the people are not going to accept that.

So we would hope that the matters we have of concern here about UFFI are serious. And we have learned over the last two and a half years, when it comes to dealing with government both at the federal and provincial levels, it's very, very frustrating. Because we've had to get an organization that brought in over $35 million we've brought into this Province in grants, in having that removed and yet we have a provincial government that wouldn't give a non-profit organization $40,000 a year to keep its office open.

Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much Mr. MacMillan. We might have a few questions if you don't mind.

SMITH:

(Tape inaudible) that don't have it in their houses. The second was where it's disposed of. I would like to know if Environment New Brunswick can tell us anything about that hazard of UFFI once it's taken out of the house. Is it a hazard in a dump?

REINHARDT:

In conjunction with the program for removing UFFI, they came to the Department, I guess, this was a little before I joined the Department and they asked the Department where this stuff should be disposed of and we have identified, I believe, approximately between 12 and 18 sites throughout the Province where we allow the UFFI to be disposed of. In areas where they provide a regular cover, the UFFI is disposed and it is covered on a daily basis. In some smaller sites, where the UFFI is not, where there's no regular cover, we require the contractor to go in and dig his hole and cover his own UFFI. We try to keep a monitoring process for disposal. The people who, I believe you referred to a one or two month program for removing, each month, I believe, as additional people are qualified, take the course, they update us on who has the qualifications so we know the qualified contractors throughout the Province and we try to monitor them as closely as possible.

SMITH:

So, you're saying there is no...you're controlling the future hazard of the UFFI once it's coming out of the houses?

REINHARDT:

Once it's coming out of the houses, once it's being disposed...

SMITH:

Does that fit with what you understand Mr. MacMillan?

MACMILLAN:

I'm not satisfied that that's being done properly. I know one part of the Province here where there was a big fight by two Conservatives whose land the government would buy to dump it on. And municipal dumps are standing by, closing their gates. And nobody could get the stuff dumped from their houses, and they decided whose property they were going to buy around St. Leonard to be a dump. Look, we went through it all with this and we're telling you that in those landfills that there has to be research done. It's not good enough for someone to get up here, like myself or the engineer and tell us yes, we decided that it should be buried. We know it was carried in bags. We know the inspection that took place in the houses. Would you believe that the federal government wanted you to leave a little space, about four by four, open in the side of the house once the contractor was done. That was to prove that it was removed from the house.

We have houses that have had the job done that the UFFI is still in. I can take you up the street, just three or four blocks from here to Mr. Deschenes property, where it wasn't removed properly. We have had homes destroyed.

SMITH:

OK. I appreciate what you're saying there, but are we not talking two different ball games here. One is if you live in the house, there's a hazard to you. If you take it out of your house and put it in a controlled dump site, is there a hazard? I don't know, I'm asking you.

MACMILLAN:

I would say Mr. Smith that if that was a designated controlled area, you know, maybe on the top of a mountain somewhere where people are not driving by it or living near it, then yes. I wouldn't be that concerned. But these are not controlled dumps. They're just privately owned dumps and they got paid a buck a bag every time the contractor took it in to them. He charged them a dollar, a dollar fifty whatever it was to have it put in there. We are not satisfied and we will not be satisfied until the Department of the Environment goes in there and we know, and are catalogued on that map of New Brunswick, where these dump sites are and what has been tested. How have they been tested. What other chemicals are in there associated with them?

SMITH:

That's really what I'm after. I think that probably you would find that there are many, many more things in the dumps that we have already that would be more dangerous than the UFFI once it's taken out of the houses. It's like your carbon monoxide from your car. As long as the car it sitting in the driveway and putting out carbon monoxide, but when you put the car in the garage and you close the door, twenty minutes later, you're dead. Is this not a similar, I might be wrong Mike, but is this not a good comparison? I think the UFFI once it's out of the house is very little...

MACMILLAN:

It's not out of the house, I'm trying to tell you half of these homes were never inspected properly, and a lot of these homes, even though they went through the grant system, still have UFFI in the homes. There was a lack of control and supervision during that period. And I'm not pointing fingers at contractors at all, I'm putting it on the government, the inspectors. You come and look at a square four feet after the whole house has been stripped and that tells you no, there's no UFFI there, there isn't any there.

In our home in 1982, you could go down in the basement and the UFFI came down through, it just poured in there like water. It came down and it baked down there and you could put your finger into that like you would the dough of bread, six years after it was put in there. I could be blindfolded and taken into any home, I didn't have to see the plugs in the wall that they had put UFFI in there. I could be blindfolded, taken into a home and I wouldn't be two feet, two steps inside the door when I could tell them they had UFFI. The odour was there, the contamination, your eyes, your smell, all of these things.

And these homes, there are still many of them yet in this Province that have that in there and in the dumps. And we're saying that unless a thorough examination is made of this, let's hope that if there is, nothing is wrong. Let's be that optimistic. But we cannot come in here and make a presentation to you and say yes, maybe it's like carbon monoxide in your car, when you walk around to shovel the snow. No, no it's much more serious than that and that's one of the problems that we're having is that people are taking comparisons that are out of here altogether with what the reality is.

LAPIERRE:

OK. We'll have one more question and then we'll have to move on because we have more speakers and the time is moving on.

LANGMAID:

I've got a couple of questions here. One is, it seems that your contractors putting it in did a hell of a poor job. In St. Andrews, there's a large number of people who put it in. I've never, I don't know of any of them who have a complaint of being able to detect the stuff after it was in. Any smell or anything like that, they took them out. They took the stuff out afterwards, but they all said that it was government policy, they got a grant for doing it, so they did it. They weren't bothered by it.

MACMILLAN:

May I answer that first, Mr. Chairman before you go to the next question. That's not what your representative from the St. Stephen area is telling is at our provincial meetings about the people that have it in their homes in your area, St. Stephen, St. Andrews, Fredericton, Woodstock, and that area. They are telling us an entirely different story. That yes, they have had illnesses, the same as who had it in every other part of the Province.

LANGMAID:

I'm talking about my friends and neighbours. The other things was that that (tape inaudible) before they put it in and I decided the damn stuff wasn't any good in 1975 and this contractor tried to get me to bug off.

The other thing is that our controlled waste sites are the places for that.

MACMILLAN:

Yes, but if the controlled waste sites were government sites, owned by government and inspected by government. That's something else.

LANGMAID:

They will be.

MACMILLAN:

Well, they are full now, I hope they will.

LAPIERRE:

I think I'll thank you very much Mr. MacMillan.

MACMILLAN:

Could be have the definition of what you believe control is?

LAPIERRE:

Controlled, I think, would be a place where wastes would be specifically packaged, specifically buried and also you would have control wells around these sites which would be monitored periodically, a couple of times a year, in order to ensure that nothing, no substances are leaking from the landfill sites. Access would be limited, only contractors could get in, no individuals could get in and it would be supervised dumping by environmental personnel.

MACMILLAN:

The problem then, I see Mr. Chairperson, is that you're going to have to remove UFFI from many of the dump sites in the Province to a controlled dump site. Some of these are privately owned and they're not controlled by anyone.

LAPIERRE:

Well, that could be a possibility if it was deemed to be hazardous and once these sites are established and this was the case.

MACMILLAN:

Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much Mr.MacMillan. (tape inaudible) I think you should be able to ask your question after. Number one, you should go to a mike and ask it because we want to record it and number two, I think in all fairness to the people who have sent in their briefs, I'll honor the list that I have here and then I'll open it up to questions.

I'll now ask the representative from the town of Dalhousie to present their brief.

BLANCHARD:

I'm James Blanchard, the deputy Mayor of Dalhousie. I would like to thank you for hearing us.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Council. We the Council, of behalf of our citizens, expect that our living environment will be protected from the effects of hazardous wastes. These wastes must be transported to remote wilderness areas and stored under the strictest of conditions to insure that they will not contaminate our environment. Our community has already had bad experiences with mercury, cadmium, and arsenic. A great deal of apprehension still persists over the arsenic poisoning events of three years ago and the resultant testing of the population to discover the extent and source of that poisoning.

As a municipality, we do not have the resources nor personnel to deal with either the topic or the actuality of hazardous waste and must rely on government agencies for advice and protection.

I would like to expand on the suggestion made in the Bathurst hearing concerning the establishment of teams throughout the Province to deal with emergencies of hazardous wastes.

Dalhousie, with two chemical plants, largest paper mill in the Province, one of the largest thermal plants (largest pile of coal and ash) and the Province's 2nd largest port, is the largest industrial complex outside of Saint John. As such, if any such teams are established, one should definitely be located in Dalhousie. Presently there is a response team at the C.I.L. Chemical plant in Dalhousie. They are trained and equipped to handle chemical spills anywhere throughout the region. The team is a co-operative effort of the various chemical corporations.

Recently an experiment was carried out in Dalhousie where PCB's in a transformer were "rendered harmless" using an experimental and expensive process. This was carried out without the knowledge of any of our civic protection agencies, i.e. Police, Firemen, EMO, etc.

We found out about this through a TV broadcast. This can be considered negligent on the part of whoever carried out that procedure. In future, the government should make it compulsory that when such procedures take place the proper protective agencies are notified. We did not know and just went by the TV broadcast and didn't realize that it was as mild as the person from Environment explained today, but according to the TV broadcast, it was the real thing, and it was rather unsettling to know that that had happened and that no one in town knew about it. And if it happened in December, the TV or news release only occurred last week, so there was a long stretch in there that nothing was know.

In closing, I would like to repeat our main concern and that is that the government enact stringent regulations regarding the transportation of hazardous goods and regulation of their storage in designated areas well away from human habitation.

Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much sir. I wonder if you would be willing to answer a few questions?

As you know, there are three components in the government proposal and one of them is for controlled wastes. In reading your brief, I see you haven't mentioned it, but you have indicated you're one of the heavily industrialized areas. So you might have some controlled waste that would go to these controlled sites. Could you tell us if you agree with the proposed controlled sites? Would you be willing to have a controlled waste site established in the surrounding areas?

BLANCHARD:

I would agree in the sense that if this waste is in a controlled site, it's far better than having the waste in uncontrolled sites, and if it's there, it must be in uncontrolled areas right now. I would much rather see it in a controlled sites even if it was in our area, yes.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Now, these sites are going to cost money and the siting of the area and the undertakings. Do you think these should be borne by the producers of waste?

BLANCHARD:

The cost?

LAPIERRE:

Yes, should the ones who produce the waste pay the cost of disposal?

BLANCHARD:

I would say to a great extent. We also have to be careful that we do not make it impossible or make it too expensive for industries to operate because we do need the employment as well. There may be government assistance required in order to make these industries competitive, but there's a very thin line there.

LAPIERRE:

So should I read from your comments that there's a cost for a clean environment, but that if the costs are too prohibitive, you're willing to live with a dirtier environment?

BLANCHARD:

No, I'm suggesting perhaps there would be some government incentive and that part of the cost may be shared by the tax payer, because we do earn our living through these dirty industries. Perhaps that would be a solution. Part of the cost may come that way. I mean on the provincial and federal level, of course, not municipal.

LAPIERRE:

Well, regardless of where....

BLANCHARD:

It's all out of the same pocket.

LAPIERRE:

I was going to say, it doesn't matter who pays for it, you know where it comes from.

BLANCHARD:

But we have to, too, make sure that our industries in our area are competitive.

LAPIERRE:

I guess we'll thank you. I have another intervener who has asked to speak on behalf of the Dalhousie/Campbellton District Labour Council, Mr. Sandy Beckingham.

BECKINGHAM:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Perhaps for the people's information... I'm a resident of Dalhousie and I'm an employee at NBIP Paper Mill. I belong to a certified trade union. I hold an office in that Local, I am also a delegate to the Campbellton/Dalhousie and District Labour Council and I'm presenting this brief on behalf of that Council, which is all the unionized members in Restigouche County. Also, I have sat, I guess, on the other side of the table as a member of the Environment Council representing labour.

I have been briefed with the Act and needless to tell you people that the Act being five inches thick, I'm sure there are rules and regulations that are covered almost every aspect of what I am saying, so I'll go on.

The Campbellton/Dalhousie and District Labour Council wishes to express their concerns with this Committee hearings over hazardous waste sites. From a positive side, we will say these hearings in Campbellton are at least a change in some views. However, this is a region which has not gained information or expertise from studies about hazards in the environment. It has learned from an unanswered past.

Heavy industries have been a part of this region for over 50 years. Needless to say these industries have changed their product and their chemical compounds over the years. The complete testing on the environment has never fully been measured.

For a clearer picture of just what we are trying to focus this Committee's attention to, let's look at the heavy industries. Using a point on a math compass and using a map of the Chaleur Bay, use a radius of 50 miles with Heron Island for the point. Let's see what industries we have. There are five pulp and paper mills, Atholville, Dalhousie, Bathurst, Chandler and New Richmond. Along with these plants, we have a lead smelter in Belledune, CIL Chemical plant in Dalhousie, different fertilizer and others which form the infrastructure for these industries such as the AC Plant in Shannonvale and a thermal generating station which we know burns over 500,000 tons of Minto coal which has a very high sulfur content.

However, we don't feel this Committee is unaware of the concerns of NB Power in the issue of acid rain. The federal government subcommittee task force during 1981-1982 came out with the brochure, the booklet, the reality of acid rain which omitted the Dalhousie thermal generating station in its tests. So we know from that, how aware the federal government is and how aware Environment New Brunswick is when they omit the largest emitter.

However, this heavily industrialized area is also an ecological haven. We have many different species of water life such as salmon, clams, lobster, smelts and others. Our forests and lakes, again, are a haven to behold. Many of us enjoy these privileges and yet at the same time we do very little to guarantee their survival.

Beaches which have been closed to the public because of contamination are not new to us in this area. From the 60's we had the problem, it's now the 80's and very little has been done.

A look at the forestry spray program is again a good example of our problems with hazards in the past. We can also direct a finger towards the managing of the forests and also bring in the Department of Health. Rather than get into a long discussion over this issue, we'll just ask these questions to the Committee.

How many pounds of DDT were sprayed in this region? How much Agent Orange? Who OK'd all these programs?

Notwithstanding, we aren't directing all the problems with hazardous waste on industry. The municipalities in this region are not by any means home free. The issue of sewage treatment plants and their operation should be looked into by many government agencies but yet we feel this will never be done.

The local dump sites in this area which belong to the municipalities can also come under question. The question will be, where are the test results and were they done correctly?

We in the Labour Council have been faced with the issue of hazardous wastes and their effect on the environment versus the issue of jobs. We can only say this is a form of blackmail, or industrial blackmail. To offset the cost of a clean environment. How much do we, the workers and citizens in this region, have to pay? While this Committee, which is very knowledgeable in environmental issues, may feel this is not a very specific presentation, we do not have the expertise with its degrees, nor the time. We rely upon contact with workers at the plant sites and as citizens of the communities. We see with our own eyes what is happening and yet we cannot see anything or have anything done.

An issue with this Labour Council has been the Blair-Malcolm Road between Campbellton and Dalhousie. Mercury dumping in the past with peat moss and other substances in an area where there is no water and sewage, only wells and septic tanks, is like mixing Molotov cocktails with dynamite. Yet it's all been done.

Are we to suppose this Committee will take into account at these hearings, the unanswered questions from the past and look towards the future? This we know is often called progress. Before we look at the future, are we to forget the past mistakes? Or even find if mistakes were made? A few examples, for your information, are the CIL polluting the Chaleur Bay and the outcome in the courts. I don't have to go into detail, you're aware. The modernization grants for the cleaning up of the environment within the pulp and paper industry. Again, I don't have to go into detail. Sewage treatment operations which are handled by, we are to believe, the RCMP city detachment.

Acid rain. We are told that the acid rain emits 3,000 miles away because of the wind. What happens when there is no wind? What happens to the homes where the bricks rot on one side? Is it all a bad batch of bricks? Or is it the wind blowing on one side? Rocks which can be crushed by human hands, we say, are not normal. Yet it can be done. Lobsters with cadmium deposits.

Clams with mercury. Smelts with zinc concentrates, deer and moose livers, and entire waters turning colour is all acceptable in this area. Swimming in sewage treatment lagoons. A high rate of cancer, birth defects, heart disease and even suicide are again in common and acceptable here. We cannot even get or attempt to get evidence to suggest to the powers that be, there are problems in this area. It is when we see our friends die and the reason is never known. Young friends and old friends alike.

This Committee may have a different view of the environment as we see it. Yet we have full authority to doubt, we live here. As a labour body we are concerned and our members are concerned. We have to live and put up with the way of life. We are recommending a change in regards to the way we deal with hazardous waste. We have yet to determine what is hazardous and what is not. The problem is something like the weather. We can see the white snow on top, however, it is the colour of the snow underneath which tells the complete story. We are still in the Stone Age and yet we are asked to go on.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Mr. Beckingham. Well, I guess if we had all the answers we wouldn't be here today, but I guess we have to accept that we are willing to do something and I guess you have to accept in good faith that recommendations that will come forth and certain procedures which, in the past, may not have seemed to the welfare of the environment, might change in the future. However, I guess I'm not an optimist to believe that everything will change overnight.

I'd like to ask one question, the mercury dumping. Is that approved? You mentioned there was a road on which mercury was dumped along the road?

BECKINGHAM:

The issue of the dump sites for mercury were designated throughout the area. In the early 70's with the peat moss industry in the Caraquet coast, coming up, an idea was thought that the peat moss was the correct substance to help bury the mercury. Unfortunately, they leaked and the problem is that the dump sites where they put them, the people along the Blair-Malcolm do not have water and sewage.

It's a small local service district which cannot afford the cost and what happens is when you have people on wells that the mercury will trickle down into the water supply eventually. Now not only have they used the Blair-Malcolm Road for dumping of mercury, they have the regional dump site there which they had all the UFFI which didn't take and when it doesn't take it ends up in a liquid form, dumped there. They also have the ash from the thermal generating station buried there and while I was sitting on your Committee, we were told by NB Power that the ash was being buried on the Blair-Malcolm Road and yet we can take a run down right there now and we can sit on top of a mountain of ash which is not being buried, which is just there.

The different chemicals from either the pulp and paper industries which are affected which use the dump are again seeping into that area and those people living there are still on wells. If you want to look at the number of people with cancer along that road, I think that if you compared them to any other road in Canada, you'd be a little bit surprised. We often refer to the Blair-Malcolm as the Love Canal of Restigouche County. And yet that falls on deaf ears. So, I mean, the problems here are many but the answers are not forthcoming.

LAPIERRE:

I would ask the representative of the Department of Environment if they have an answer to this, but first I'd like to ask you one question. These substances that are dumped on the Blair-Malcolm Road, I would consider to be prime candidates for a controlled waste site. Would you be in favor of the controlled waste site proposal as..

BECKINGHAM:

As a proposed waste site, what are you people prepared to say is in the planning? Are you saying that the dollars will be spent correctly and that the full infrastructure of government will be used to offset a hazardous waste site? If you are recommending that, I will surely endorse it and do whatever in my power to do, to get the endorsement. But if you are not going to go full circle over the issue of dump sites, then we're going to say forget about it..

LAPIERRE:

I think the proposal that's put forth is a proposal that would see for an adequate landfilling and proper disposal. I don't think that's what being proposed is something like what's being done now. I certainly wouldn't endorse a hazardous one. It would have to be one in which security is guaranteed.

BECKINGHAM:

OK, and these securities will be followed as part of recommendations?

LAPIERRE:

I think there is a plan for monitoring of wells, peripheral wells so you can see each year if something is coming out, then you can get at it right away.

BECKINGHAM:

What we have in this area is that you send your water away to ge tested and I think it's like any other area, it comes back to results are potable or not potable. And that is the total testing which is done on the water in this area. Perhaps Moncton has a different way, I don't know.

LAPIERRE:

I think in one of these controlled sites, the testing to be envisaged would be somewhat different. I wonder if I could get an answer on the first aspect, why is (tape inaudible)

GODIN:

...very much information. I believe you are referring to the CIL disposal site for mercury sludge and if you are, then all I can tell you about that is there is a monitoring well field which is being tested by both Environment Canada and Environment New Brunswick on a regular basis to see if there is any leaching of mercury in the groundwater. This well field is between the mercury waste site and the homes in that area. If that is the site that you are referring to.

LAPIERRE:

Is that data available?

GODIN:

The data that is collected by Environment New Brunswick would be available. I can't speak for Environment Canada.

BECKINGHAM:

We have to understand that CIL is not the only mercury user. We have in the past say, for example at NBIP, we have when industry started up it operated on a five and six day. On that sixth and seventh day, they would boil out their complete systems with mercury. And they used chemicals which were dumped out into the water supplies, so the mercury content in Northern New Brunswick is very high. We have reduced the emissions today not because we have caught on to the environment, but we have gone to full seven-day operation. So that means we don't shut down to clean out any more. So that has eliminated a lot of the mercury dumping in this area.

But there is quite a bit from the past and like, as kids in school we played with mercury in our hand when the CIL first came to town. It was quite the thing. There was no information, no knowledge available that it was a hazard. Today we find that it is a hazard, the reports of the missing mercury from all the areas again is quite sad. Who took it? Who sold it? Where it went is the problem. We have no control over it. So, the testing that you're going to get from Environment New Brunswick and the testing that you're going to get from Environment Canada and the testing that was done 10 years ago or 15 years ago, you know, you're going to put that all together into a complete package and come with a solution for a hazardous waste site. I'd say we're going to be a long time waiting. Wouldn't you say?

LAPIERRE:

I don't know. I hope not. There is another question. But before, I had another individual who had requested to question before so, I don't know. Is your question related to this?

JOHNSON:

It's a clarification. I'm John Johnson from CIL, Technical Superintendent. About the mercury sludge, it's actually mercury-contaminated sludge at a very low concentration of mercury. It's below 5 parts per million in the most part. It's in the very low parts per millions.

LAPIERRE:

And that sludge is deposited along this road? At what quantities?

JOHNSON:

I don't have the exact figures on me, but we had deposited there in about five or six burials and it's about 100 feet by 50 feet by eight feet deep. The sludge is made up mostly of calcium sulfate.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Well, thank you very much.

LANGMAID:

Is this coming out as elemental mercury? Is this a compound, chloride or?

JOHNSON:

Most of it is most likely as a mercury chloride. There may be some elemental mercury but, as I say, it's very low parts per million.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Mr. Beckingham. I ask if Mr. Beckingham has any comments or questions?

BECKINGHAM:

No more in regards to the mercury. One of the things that really bothers us is the DDT which was used in the 50's in this area. I mean, we had workers who used to put their helmets into it to keep away the flies and what have you. We still have barrels of DDT in our woods, which are still lying there, and I think the time period for those containers to start rotting is about due. And yet the DDT has been dead and buried for a long time but we still do not address it. So, I'm wondering if we're going to address mercury in 40 years from now, or if we're going to develop a playground on the Blair-Malcolm Road. I have some real concerns about the way we do things.

LAPIERRE:

Well, I guess we'll have to thank you for your concerns, Mr. Beckingham. We don't have all the answers, but hopefully... one moment....it relates to Mr. Beckingham? You want to ask a question of Mr. Beckingham? To add something? OK, go ahead.

WALSH:

I just wanted to respond to something from the individual from CIL who said that it was low-level contamination of mercury and he indicated that it was 5 parts per billion. Well according to the Environmental Surveillance Report of the Environmental Protection Service out of Halifax, the sediment level acceptable limit is .1 parts per billion. This is according to the scientific literature, and some scientists in the States do not even accept this, so I would question his remarks.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. At this time I would like to, it guess, it concludes the official presentations. I had another presentation that was supposed to be made, une présentation par les Dammes d'Acadie et je crois pas qu'il y a personne ici qui est prêtes à faire la présentation. Puis je crois que je....oui?

ARSENAULT:

M. le Président et membres de Conseil, je me suis rencontré avec les Dames d'Acadie cette après-midi puis malheureusement dû à la maladie, je pense qu'elles vont vous l'envoyer par courrier.

LAPIERRE:

Merci. Yes?

MACMILLAN:

Mr. Chairman, there's one report I forgot to mention in regards to UFFI and that's the McLennan Report which was made by the government and was exposed by the Toronto Star under the Freedom to Information Act. They were able to get that and they quoted from it in the Toronto Star. I didn't have it in my brief because at the present time, it's in the lawyers' office. But it would be of great value to your Committee to have that McLennan Report.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much Mr. MacMillan. I think at this time what I would like to do would be to invite any other people from the hall, yes, who have not indicated or who had not indicated prior to the start of the meeting that they would like to have something else to add to the meeting or if anyone has any comments to make to any of the previous speakers. So, at this time, I'll ask for, I have one person here who has asked but there's a gentleman in front here who had asked a question some time back. So, if you still want to question, could you use a mike please?

ALLEN:

This question actually pertains to Mr. MacMillan's comment on the spraying of DDT on the lines. I'm not sure exactly what's printed in your handout that was given, as an employee of NB Tel, we had not sprayed any of our telephone cables with DDT. Now if this is to go on record, I believe it was NB Power that was spraying their power lines with DDT.

LAPIERRE:

We haven't read the report as of yet because we've just received it prior to discussions at the meeting so I can't answer your question, maybe Mr. MacMillan can.

MACMILLAN:

Mr. Chairperson, members of the Board, when I was referring to the workers who were employed on the projects removing the UFFI I made a reference that I would hope that in ten or 15 years time, we wouldn't have these employees forming an organization and complaining that, Gerry White I think his name is and others who worked for the power company and were supposed to have sprayed Agent Orange or whatever it was on the lines and are now in some sort of a lawsuit with the government. That's the comparison I was making. I was hoping that the government would listen to the recommendations we were making and see that these people had medical examinations, preventing that sort of explosion, ten or 15 years from now.

LAPIERRE:

Thanks a lot. Your comments would be read into the minutes and do you have an other further comments?

ALLEN:

There's just one other question I'd like to ask the Board here. As a representative of a small community as well as a member of the solid waste proposal sites in this area, I notice you keep asking after every presentation whether or not we would accept one of these sites in the area. I'm just curious to wonder, are there any plans to establish one of these sites within the area?

LAPIERRE:

Well, I don't think at the present time that there are any plans to establish them in any specific area. Studies are underway to find out where they could be established but I'm asking this in relation to the discussions of which I'm sure you heard of in relation to Renous, where supposedly a site was found to store asbestos and then we know what happened. But, I think we're asking this to, I'm asking the question to have people think about it because it's great to say we need to store waste but then everybody comes up with, "yes, store it, but really not in my backyard or anywhere where I can see it or feel for it". What I would like to get is the feeling of the people in New Brunswick because this is one of the things we want to find out. What do the people think about the waste? It has to be stored someplace.

ALLEN:

Well, right now we're just trying to make the people of this area aware of the problem that we have of just the solid waste for residential and commercial and believe you me, we're talking a lot of dollars and cents here and we haven't even scratched the surface yet.

LAPIERRE:

No one said it was going to be cheap and this is why I queried the member from Dalhousie, when he said there is a cost. To me there really isn't a cost. If you want a clean environment, there's only one cost and we have to pay it.

LANGMAID:

The other problem is that the old sites were not, they were just picked out, anyplace, a backyard, dump them in. No scientific study was made into where they should go and what the proper conditions should be. This is part of the problem, they were never controlled. They had no control whatsoever. They put them in gravel pits, everything else. There's no soil control, nothing. We hope to hell they get over that and do something proper.

ALLEN:

I'm not questioning the procedures that were used in the past, it's just that I am involved in one particular committee there now and I've learned a lot about solid waste. I just hope that we don't turn around with all the money that's involved in the one we're working on now, have to go through this again with a surprise coming out...

LAPIERRE:

Well, some one is going to have to look at it.

SMITH:

Can I ask a question?

LAPIERRE:

OK, go ahead.

SMITH:

You say you're currently with a group that is planning a regional dump. Is that the idea?

ALLEN:

A solid waste disposal site.

SMITH:

What percentage of the area, or population, are you covering as far as pick up goes?

ALLEN:

We are covering from Jacquet River, I believe it is, up to Adam's Gulch.

SMITH:

You'll pick it all up?

ALLEN:

Well, at this moment it's still in the planning stages. It's a big area and we've just made a decision on a contractor to some surveying. We haven't even sat down to look at any site proposals...

SMITH:

No, I'm not talking about the disposal...

LAPIERRE:

They haven't started. They've just named the Commission.

SMITH:

You're just naming the Commission now?

ALLEN:

We have a Commission and we're in the process of establishing sites which will be examined by the contractor but that's about as far as it's gotten to this point.

SMITH:

Thank you.

LANGMAID:

What kind of a population is that going to cover?

ALLEN:

I believe somewhere around 30,000-40,000 people. That's what we're looking at.

LAPIERRE:

Mr. Reinhardt did you have a question or comment?

REINHARDT:

Just to more directly address the question of rural pick up. I think at this time the Commission is just in the preliminary stages, it's only had two meetings, the second of which they've chosen the site identification contractor or the firm that would identify a number of sites. However, they have not addressed the question of pickup. As a solid waste engineer, I would suggest that collection systems, municipal and rural, are as important as the disposal site itself. And their implementation is going to be somewhat difficult I suspect, judging....

SMITH:

Does that mean you have a plan to pick up everything or not?

REINHARDT:

We will get the Commissions to develop a comprehensive collection plan within their Commission area. And this will come.

SMITH:

That means you will be picking it all up. The guy that won't go ten kilometres today to go to one of the hundreds of dumps we have, will not go 50 kilometres to one of the dozens of dumps. That's my question.

REINHARDT:

You're 100% right. I think that 80% of the rest of North America has encountered, in the past, that problem and through an education process in which everyone participates, they overcome this.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thanks a lot, Mr. Reinhardt. We have another intervener, so we will proceed. Mr. Harquail?

HARQUAIL:

Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of your Committee. I am Morris Harquail. As a taxpayer and as a concerned citizen, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak this afternoon, because I think your work is very, very important and obviously if we look at all the issues that are facing us touching on the question of the environment, it's very, very timely that you're doing this exercise in the province of New Brunswick.

One of the aspects that I wanted to stress today under the decision-making process of dealing with hazardous wastes and the management of the system in New Brunswick which, as is stated, falls within the responsibility of the Minister of Municipal Affairs who is responsible for the Environment, is the whole question of public information and admission of serious environmental questions that citizens of New Brunswick will be faced with on a day to day basis.

If there's any comment I could make today is that this would go a long way in alleviating the question of fear because not only is there the danger of what we're faced with by various aspects of pollutants, whether it's in the air or the air or in products that we buy as consumers.

With the kind of media we have today there's also the question of fear that has to be considered. I would like to stress to your Committee to recommend to the government that they deal with this question that I raise and by having the courage to eliminate the political aspects relating to serious questions touching on hazardous wastes or the management of our environment.

I think that we have had some good corporate citizens in the Province, that show some good faith and I can think of Brunswick Mining when they had the difficulty with some of the waste coming out of their operations at Belledune. When they admitted that it was having an adverse affect on the lobster fishery in the Belledune area. And not only were they prepared to tell the public about it, they took effective action by committing themselves to expenditures to put equipment in place to reduce and eliminate as much as possible that pollutant that was having an adverse affect on the marine life in that area.

We saw most recently in Moncton that question of the materials that were stored at the Public Works building. And from what we can observe from all the reports the governments, both federal and provincial, were not only in the process of making a decision but they had already built the facility to contain this material and the material had been there for some time, at much concern to the citizens of that particular municipality. But they were never told what in fact the ones who had the responsibility of managing that particular hazardous material, what they intended to do with it. It seemed to me it was much more easily understood and accepted by the public once they were told what they were going to do with it. I think for the citizens of Moncton, their main concern was to have it removed from within the city limits.

And then for the people of Renous, when they learned they were going to transfer it there, there was the hue and cry and sort of coming to the back door, after the public opposed it and made the protest, then they changed their minds and this material will now, according to the latest media CBC reports are being transferred to the province of Quebec.

I think these are current and very graphic examples of a lesson that can be learned that I would say that it's much better to be up front, truthful and honest with the public when we're dealing with a serious situation arising out of the handling of hazardous waste materials.

Another example is right here in Campbellton when we had that alleged spill going into the Restigouche. You know, we had CBC and CTV and the media converging here like we've never had coverage before. Along the lines of my point about scare tactics and the fear that was brought out, the early reports were that this was, you know, going to put in danger human life and marine life in the Restigouche River, only to find out later when the experts arrived on the scene, subsequent reports revealed that this material, the amount of material that was resting on the snow in the yards at the time, in fact the actual danger was quite minimal and that it had been contained and controlled. But for a couple of days because of the media hype, there was a lot of fear.

That would be my main point, not only in the necessity of having appropriate legislation and appropriate funds made available to deal with the proper management of the environment and the type of hazardous materials and items that would be harmful to the health to protect the consumer which an obvious point that I'm sure you've heard throughout your hearings. But to recommend as well that we be told up front factually what the situation would be, when we have a catastrophe or have a loss of the type of waste that might adversely affect human life.

Even for a small province like New Brunswick we've already had some fairly serious cases and my comment today would be that most of the information was held in a way that there was an attempt to keep this information from the public and I think that is wrong. And I would very strongly recommend that when we have this type of catastrophe or whatever type of spill there will be, that the government would have the courage to, through your recommendations, to deal with it, so that the people can understand what the problems are and deal with them. I think in that way we'll have much more cooperation and much more success in understanding all sides of the proper management of hazardous waste materials and in dealing effectively with trying to protect that very important commodity, which is the air we breathe and the very water that we drink.

We know that that's becoming a very precious commodity in itself. If we listen to what the Americans are saying and the kind of eye that they have on that resource. Looking to our own country to try to negotiate for the export of water from Canada. So, if we're going to be successful in retaining any of this, we're going to have to have good management practices within the overall administration of environmental questions.

If we're going to have the support of the people, then I think governments are going to have to trust the people to have enough capacity to work along with them so that they be told, indeed, what they are faced with, what the problems are, what the risks are, so that they can, instead of protesting and opposing government moves, work in a cooperative measure with governments on the question of management of the environment.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much Mr. Harquail. Are there any questions? Yes? Is there a question, Mr. Arsenault?

ARSENAULT:

Merci, M. Président, mais pas sur la présentation de M....

LAPIERRE:

Pas sur la présentation de M. Harquail. Oui?

ARSENAULT:

J'étais debout avant qu'il a fait sa présentation.

Mr. Chairman, the question that you opened the door, more or less, to the general public to ask questions and my question or my statement is...we no longer can bury our garbage in our backyards. There has to be some system. There has to be something better than what we have today. It may be acceptable what we have today, to some people, but to the majority of the people, it is not acceptable. That's my concern.

Number two is that if we cannot only erect these plants at every 200 miles, well by gosh, let's put them together. And if it's going to cost something, well we want to live the way that we're living, and if it's going to cost an extra 50 cents a week or whatever it may be, because we want clean air, we want water and we want to be able to use our beaches in the summer, well there's only one alternative. The money has to come from someplace and if we want all of these things, all of these services, there's only one way.

Now, your question was should the user pay the fee, and the answer is yes. In every community that I know of, the user pays. If the user happens to be a PCB user, or customer, and if it's going to cost $100 a gallon to get rid of it, well let the user pay. Because you can be rest assured that the reason that they're using PCB's to begin with is to make a profit. Now I'm not anti-profit here, but you can be rest assured that if they need whatever chemical to do whatever that they're manufacturing and I don't care if it's oil paints or varnishes or PCB's, they're there for the profit. If to get rid of the waste is going to $100 a gallon, well, let it be. And if we have to construct these things every 200 miles, Mr. Chairman, in order to have some form of adequate disposal at our hands, let it be at every 200 miles, but let's have something that is acceptable and will be acceptable 50 years from today.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. Madam do you have a comment?

LAPOINTE:

I'm Mrs. Donald Lapointe and I have UFFI in my home and I've have removed of it because my kids were very, very sick. They were in Halifax for a month and the (tape inaudible). I missed the UFFI $5,000 grant and I had to remove it on my own at an awful expense. My husband is not working. I hope that you can reopen the registration to help us out, please.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much Madame. I don't know, this is a point that falls outside the scope of our mandate but we could pass on your comments to the appropriate ministry.

Are there any other comments? Yes, Mr. Hill.

HILL:

My name is Gerry Hill. I'm the Information Officer for the Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment in Fredericton. I just wanted to respond to Mr. Harquail's point about public consultation. One of the responsibilities that our office carries for the department is not just the information out process but the arrangement of meetings just like this.

We're going to be doing a lot more of these in the months and in the years ahead. The reason for that, just to clarify a little bit, the government's, call it position paper, on hazardous waste management that you see on the tables there and were distributed in early January represent I guess, you'd say, a very early preliminary stage, conceptual stage, if you want, in the development of a comprehensive waste management program for New Brunswick.

It's perceived that the putting of that plan into full operation would take the next three to five years, really. Now the Environmental Council will be, this is their last meeting as you know of this particular series, and they have the responsibility of preparing a report to the Minister which we expect will be sometime in late April or early May, with recommendations. Then, obviously, the Minister will be able to consider their recommendations and then begin to think about the kinds of directions the government will want to go in this area.

In the course of then developing any specific project whether, for example be it a controlled waste disposal facility or a hazardous waste storage and transfer station if this was deemed to be appropriate, or any one of the regional solid waste commission landfills which it's been proposed that there be 13, at least, of those in the Province... every one of those projects, when they become specific projects, will be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment in the Province. When you have a project which is subject to E.I.A. that requires the development of a detailed environmental study which usually takes several months to do from a scientific point of view.

Once that study is complete, then there is a large public consultation process which again would involve meetings like this. But in those kinds of meetings you wouldn't be dealing with a conceptual plan, you'd be dealing with a specific plan, a plan to propose project A, B or C in location X, Y, or Z. So, the consultation process is going to built in from now until the plan is fully operational. And that's a committment which the former Minister, Mr. Harmer, made in the Legislature last spring and it's one that's going to involve us in running a lot of meetings like this. So I guess I just wanted to assure Mr. Harquail that the process is going to be a very open one throughout its development. Also, Mr. Chairman, just for the record, I should note that it wasn't the Province that proposed the Renous project, it was the federal department of Public Works. (tape inaudible)

LAPIERRE:

Thanks a lot, Mr. Hill. There is another question. Yes sir?

DOUCET:

James Doucet, Dalhousie. Yes, I'd like to make comments on two questions that you asked earlier on, I think when you asked Mrs. Walsh and another one you asked the Mayor of Dalhousie about controlled sites in their areas or something like this.

I feel that we should have it. If we're doing the pollution, I think we should have the place where we should have it controlled. I'd sooner see it here than having it transferred it somewhere in many different places and to have an accident somewhere on the railroad or on the highway like has been happening lately and it seems like every time there's an accident, it's always by a river or by a lake or something. So I don't know if that's giving us a message of not. I'd sooner see it, if we people are polluting it, the industries around here are polluting it. I think we should have the thing here than instead of 50 miles of 200 miles away, as long as it's controlled right.

Second comment was on your other question. Do you feel that the industry or whoever is doing the pollution should pay? I feel that they should pay. We had an incident happen in Charlo about a pig farmer. He was polluting the air. What did they do? They brought him to court and he had to pay. CIL is doing the same thing in Dalhousie, I live in Dalhousie, they're polluting the air. You can smell it when you drive into town. Nobody's charging them for polluting the air. I think they should pay for all these things. Something has to be done. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. Yes sir?

CHEDORE:

Scott Chedore. I live in one of the cleanest communities in the area and also one of the most polluted communities in the area, Dalhousie Junction, polluted of course, because of the site of the regional dump, the mercury, the ash, just about anything that anyone wants to dump seems to be dumped just east of Dalhousie Junction.

I have another concern and I don't know whether you people can do much about it, but it might be to prevent the disposal of some dangerous commodities.

The CN Rail line at Dalhousie Junction which is carrying all sorts of dangerous commodities, just in the past few years has been, well, they've had a slow order as long as I can remember on a stretch of rail line because the bank is sliding away. And we could, one morning, wake up and find a train loaded with chemicals on the beach, if we happen to wake up at all, I guess. How we would dispose of those chemicals? I'm just wanting to save you people the job of looking after those chemicals by getting CN in to do something about that damn rail line, to begin with. I don't know whether you can put pressure on a federal body like that or not, but it could save us some problems in the future.

The other thing you're discussing would the people of this area accept a site in this region for dangerous commodities? I think the reason that you're getting rather evasive and I notice that Jim said that he would accept it if it's properly managed. The problem in the past and I know like Mr. Allen was speaking a while ago about sitting on a Committee trying to find a regional dump site right now, we did that for several years just a few years ago, trying to find one when some of the municipalities in the area wouldn't participate. Now they're finally beginning to. We shouldn't be having this problem now. It could have been settled when the Dalhousie regional dump was made.

But at least we're getting to that now, but you'll go on for years and years and years looking after that but when we did decide on our site in Dalhousie we were guaranteed by your Department that it would be operated properly. It never has been from the first day that it opened. It has never been operated properly. I must give CIL credit because they did at least participate with the local service district of Dalhousie Junction. We didn't have much control about whether or not their site was going in our area but they at least did notify us and make us aware of what was there. Your Department has not managed the site at Dalhousie Junction properly. So that is the reason why people are probably a little bit concerned when you say, "Will you accept a site in your area?". The reason is, we've been told before that it will have the following guidelines otherwise all hell is going to break loose and we're going to come down hard on them. You haven't come down hard on anybody ever before, so why should we trust you again. That's the attitude of the people locally, I think.

Something else I would like to request is, I wonder if you could get the City of Campbellton to go back to their old sewage system. It was much more efficient as far as we, at Dalhousie Junction, are concerned. Ask any fisherman that was fishing smelts this winter what kind of sludge and sewage he was getting in his nets. Ask anybody that has a cottage on the beach what's rolling up onto the beach this summer or last summer or the summer before and compare them. The problem has been that, before we used to have everybody flushing their toilets once and a while and it was coming into the water. Now what we have is the equivalent of several hundred thousand toilets being released at one time because the sludge seems to be washed out just before the environment guy happens to come to check to see what the damn thing looks like and how it's operating.

Ask the people of Dalhousie Junction how they like the Campbellton sewage system. We don't. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. First of all I just would like to clarify one point and then I'll ask Mr. Reinhardt to answer your question.

Number one is, we are not the Department of the Environment. We are citizens like yourself who have taken time from our busy lives, just like you take time from your life, to take care of your environment. We act as consultants to the environment but we are not part of the Department of the Environment. I'd just like to clarify that. We try to suggest ways and means in which the environment can be bettered and like you, we don't always succeed. We ask questions, we make recommendations, but that's about the extent of our involvement and we...

SMITH:

The Department of the Environment is not running any waste dumps. The Department of the Environment is not running any dumps.

LAPIERRE:

Mr. Reinhardt, could you answer the responsibility of running the dumps. Are you running the dump in question or is it the Department of Transportation? Or local municipality?

REINHARDT:

As you know, I believe it's a municipal-operated site. I'm not quite sure, in as much that it was intended to be somewhat of a regional site, but I understand that the Town of Dalhousie is actually running the site.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Do you monitor the site or is it totally up to the town to monitor it?

REINHARDT:

We monitor that site on a regular basis. That site, to call a spade here a spade, I think we monitor that site regularly. That site was conceived in the late 70's and intended to be run as a landfill site. It was designed, it was one of the first sites that was designed for a landfill site. However, since its beginning it has never been operated satisfactorily. Our Department has through letters and communications have tried to get them to do so and we have been unsuccessful. And I think we don't have or are not using a big enough stick to do so.

LAPIERRE:

You've told the Town of Dalhousie that they weren't running the dump correctly?

REINHARDT:

Yes.

LAPIERRE:

Is the representative from the Town of Dalhousie still here?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

No, but their newspaper is.

LAPIERRE:

Well, then maybe then can report it.

REINHARDT:

In fact last fall, I point out, that roughly 40 municipalities in the Province were issued, or excuse me, I correct that, 40 sites were issued Certificates of Approval outlining operations at sites and Dalhousie received one of these certificates.

LAPIERRE:

Of non-compliance?

BECKINGHAM:

Mr. Chairman, maybe a little clarification here. I'm from Point La Nim so God help Dalhousie if I speak for them. What happens is a proposed regional dump means that all regions concerned will come in on the proposal. So what happens when all the regions don't come into the proposal it gets out of a proposed regional to a municipal and then what happens is that a municipality will agree to pick up the price tag, knowing that through Municipal Affairs they'll offset other monies into revenues into Dalhousie to offset the cost while they can, as a municipality, put a tender out to contract the dump? They are responsible to pay the cheque to the contractor who looks after the dump. And they become responsible with the contractor that he must live up to the New Brunswick standards. When New Brunswick Environment tells Dalhousie, you're not living up to your standards, they in turn go to the contractor and say you're not living up to the standards. Who is responsible? And it comes back to the old issue. Well, it's supposed to be a region and we're all supposed to be involved, but we're not, but Dalhousie got caught.

So, you can go from there. If that makes any sense, it's a little bit clearer. That's what goes on.

LAPIERRE:

It's really clear, I must admit. I would like to ask a second question of Mr. Reinhardt concerning the sewage flushing, lagoon flushing, if I understand it correctly, which means one big flush once in a while instead of small flushes periodically. Why does this happen? When...

REINHARDT:

I can answer that very simply. I'm a solid waste engineer, not a liquid waste engineer.

LAPIERRE:

It's another engineer who isn't here, well we'll ask him when..Yes?

DOHANEY:

I'm with the City of Campbellton. Just to clarify that. It's a continuous process. There are no sludge tanks per se. It's more or less a number of baffles and filters, if you wish, and the sewage arrives at the plant, is treated through the baffles and filters, if you wish to call them that, and the sewage continues through, the flow continues through and there is no flushing of tanks or...

LAPIERRE:

How long is it held in the system?

DOHANEY:

The retention time can vary. It may be as much as seven days of solid suspended particles within the system itself but it varies in accordance with many factors: flows; quantities of flow...

LAPIERRE:

Is it oxygenated?

DOHANEY:

Yes, that is how the micro organisms treat the suspended solids.

LAPIERRE:

So when it comes out, you're supposed to have a clear liquid?

DOHANEY:

You have a treated sewage which is, in effect, supposed to have all of the harmful, or most of the harmful, products eliminated from the sewage itself.

LAPIERRE:

Why do they get this bank roll on their beach?

DOHANEY:

I can't answer that. That could be something as well to do with the mill up in Atholville. I don't have the answers. I can just tell you what the process is.

LAPIERRE:

Was it there before the sewer system was installed? But the mill was there before wasn't it?

DOHANEY:

I'm not aware. I mean the mill was there before the sewage treatment plant, yes.

KERR:

The mill has been there since 1930. Do you have primary treatment and secondary treatment?

DOHANEY:

Yes sir.

KERR:

Is the primary sludge removed from the system and stored somewhere?

DOHANEY:

It is removed after secondary treatment.

KERR:

You don't have a primary treatment where you remove the solid material and then a secondary treatment of biological oxidation of you....

DOHANEY:

Yes we do. We have grit removal chambers...

KERR:

No, I don't mean grit. I mean the sludge, the suspended material in the sanitary sewage. Is that removed on a filter before biological oxidation?

DOHANEY:

No sir. It's secondary treatment which is removed from the clarifier. There are no filters per se. There are grit chambers and baffles, etc., etc,

LAPIERRE:

Who approved your system?

DOHANEY:

It's through the New Brunswick Department of Environment.

LAPIERRE:

There's another gentleman out there who had asked to speak before so..There's a question first to the gentleman from Campbellton.

LANGMAID:

Do your storm sewers go into that too?

DOHANEY:

There are three really different types of sewers, if you wish. Storm sewers which are solely surface run off, and they may be hooked in with laterals from houses. There are combined sewers which are a combination of storm sewers and sanitary sewers and a third is a sanitary sewer, primarily sanitary.

LANGMAID:

In other words your storm sewers flow into your treatment plant?

DOHANEY:

Not in all cases, no. If there is a separation of sewers, meaning a sanitary and a storm sewer then it does not flow into the system. If it's only a combined sewer system, where practical, it does flow into the system.

LANGMAID:

What percentage of your sewers are combined?

DOHANEY:

I can't answer that. I'm not aware of the facts or the figures pertaining to that.

LAPIERRE:

Ok. Thank you. Sir, go ahead? We'll come back to Mr. MacMillan, he was there first please. Sorry about that Lofty.

CLARK:

My name is Bill Clark. I'm Editor of the Dalhousie News. Pardon me for speaking, I usually just sit there and listen. But I think I do have a specific question for Mr. Reinhardt dealing with the Dalhousie dump. Is the Town Council actually aware that things are not being done properly on that dump site? See, Council meeting is Monday night and I've got to have my questions ready.

REINHARDT:

I cannot answer that in particular. We have communicated one or two letters with the Town. We sent them a Certificate of Approval to the Town office last September. I believe in November, we sent another letter indicating to them which conditions of that certificate were not in compliance. Now, I'm at a loss to say exactly who in the Council or administration saw the letter or dealt with the letter.

CLARK:

OK. There's one other point and perhaps Morris Harquail will forgive me for bringing this up, but he made some reference to media hype and in the particular instance that he was talking about the acid spill in the CN yard in Campbellton. At least some publication attempted to present the true and exact facts of the situation rather than create any scare tactics or try to scare the public, rather reassure them of what the actual situation was, partly based on what was remembered from some high school chemistry. I think that there are a lot of media who are trying to present environmental issues in a responsible manner and I'm sorry to see that we got nailed with something again. It's usually only the Prime Minister that does that.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. I don't think we need a comment to that one. Mr. MacMillan?

MACMILLAN:

Thank God for the media. We're 300 miles from Saint John, two hundred and some miles from Fredericton and about 235 miles from Moncton. So, we're away up here. So, if you see anybody down that way, tell them about us. That we had this day here today.

Two things. On the question of what's going where. Look at the map at the back of my brief, the arrows tell you where the combinations are and where they are going.

The second thing is at the plant, I think it's too bad you don't have a chance to make a tour, but the plant is built so that if the sewage comes into a concrete tank, and it's very convenient. You lower down the chute here and you close that off, you pick this one up and it goes through the plant. And it is filtered. So when you're full of sludge all you have to do is let it go out in the Restigouche. Put this one down and raise this one and out to the Restigouche it goes. So, it was built very well for us, but not good for the people around Dalhousie. I concur with the people from Dalhousie Crossing because I happened to be going down there on the UFFI program and once they talked to me about Campbellton, they just bombarded us.

Said, we can't swim no more, people in Richardville used to swim one time, believe it or not. You can't do it anymore. The whole operation some day, somebody is going to have to say to the provincial government or some government, come and get this plant.

Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Mr. MacMillan. Mrs. Walsh?

WALSH:

Thank you. I have two more, one is a comment and I guess the other is a question.

I wanted in response to Mr. Harquail's comment that it was an alleged incident and I think I was an incident and I think perhaps we should examine that particular incident as indicative of the problems that can occur with the transportation of dangerous goods. I do think being rather pessimistic, having been involved in the environmental movement for a long time, I'm not quite as satisfied as he is that the so-called experts have answered all our questions. I still have some more questions and our Association does have more questions about that particular incident. I'm really pleased to see that Mr. Harquail is now interested in environmental issues.

Secondly, I would like to ask questions about the Point Lepreau incident. I understand that that isn't necessarily an issue that perhaps implicates the area of the Restigouche but I think it is of concern to us as tax payers of this Province that we have a nuclear generating station that's losing at least 1/2 million dollars a day because they have a hole in one of their, in one of the containment walls that they can't find. I don't particularly find that to be of great industrial expertise. I wonder if your Council could recommend to the government, as I have and we have in our own way, to perhaps speed up that process and to perhaps look into it more expediently. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much for your comment.

HARQUAIL:

Mr. Chairman, if I may take one minute in this, which is developing into an interesting debate. Through you, Mr. Chairman, just to say that it's my belief that the environment is not any one particular individual's question, or any one particular group. Environment touches upon and can affect each and every one of us. Point number one. So no one has, you know, cabbaged the corner on the question of environment. It affects everyone.

On the question raised about the media. I want to clarify that I was speaking about the electronic media. Leaving aside completely the efficiency of the writers of the various journals in the area. I would never want to say anything with respect to their expertise. That's an area I wouldn't even touch. But what I am talking about are these two hour instant experts who come with the cameras and report these incidents, when we can't even get daily coverage.

If you'll notice when there's an issue in New Brunswick, let's take environment, they interview everyone in the streets of Moncton, Fredericton and Saint John and after that there's not much of a commentary by the rest of the citizens simply because CTV and CBC do not have reporters with their cameras covering northern New Brunswick. What happens is when you have some attempted robbery or a shooting or any kind of a bank robbery, or a spill? Then the helicopters arrive overhead and the wizards ride out with the cameras and this is when you hear from the streets that there's a threatening of someone dying or being killed up there because there's been a spill. That's what I meant about the scare, that brings to the mind of the public fear. That there is fear that no one out there is protecting us.

And that was my message today to government because government represent people and that's directly their responsibility, not to contribute to fear. So, I'm just hoping that in your recommendations, there will be a system to deal with this. We know after Mississauga and some other major disasters, after all those years that nothing was put in place, there's now legislation and laws being put in place to deal with these types, there's more supervision and controls of moving hazardous goods. Look at that transportation through our Province where there were charges laid and the company's being sued now and they can't find the owners of the company, that went through this Province as a matter of fact.

I think that's encouraging that governments in the 80's have dealt with the question of bringing on some strict regulations and controls about the movement of dangerous goods but I just say that on the whole global question. If governments were prepared to have as a policy, be more forthright with citizens, then we wouldn't have to rely on some overnight reporter coming in with a camera, be it CTV or any other network, bringing you the news that there is a very dangerous and serious situation in your community which supports my argument about the question of fear. And I think that has to be dealt with.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? Yes?

CHOUINARD:

Oui, je me nomme Louis-Phillippe Chouinard. Je suis résident de la Province de Québec puis je travaille pour la CLAC Malauze qui est une inscription de service de santé. Je suis venu ici en tant qu'observateur puis j'apprécie ce que le province de Nouveau-Brunswick est en train de faire comme intervention au niveau de la préoccupation de produits toxiques.

On a un peu les mêmes préoccupations du côté de la province de Québec puis dans le travail pour lequel j'étais embauché, aussi à la CLAC Malauze de Matapédia. C'est de produire d'ici un an un programme qui traitera de la santé environnementale. Le territoire que j'ai à couvrir correspond relativement de côté du Nouveau-Brunswick à la hauteur de Tide Head jusqu'à Charlo environ, ce que correspond au Québec aux municipalités de l'Ascencion à Maria. Je suis venu ici en tant qu'observateur. J'ai grandement apprécié la qualité des interventions des gens de la province de différents milieux. J'ai ici en ma possession un document qui était produit par un groupe environnemental qui est en train de se mettre sur pied du côté de Québec, et qui était bâtisée vers plus. Ce document-là contient, en fait, des préoccupations semblables à celles qui étaient discutées ici puis j'aimerais le déposer auprès de cette Commission, à titre d'information. Ce qu'on y retrouve rapidement, c'est la pêche au saumon qui est quand même une ressource menacée à cause de la contamination des eaux, l'utilisation de pesticides pour les arrosages forestiers, la qualité des eaux de plages aussi qui se trouvent à être souillées par différents produits chimiques qui sont originaires de la Baie de Chaleur des propres industries du côté québecois.

Mais qu'on présume aussi qu'il y en a qui sont issus du Nouveau-Brunswick aussi, des déchets solides, évidemment des déchets toxiques qu'on connaît les mêmes problèmes d'entreposage auxquels le Nouveau-Brunswick fait face. Ca fait que si vous me permettriez, je vais...

LAPIERRE:

Merci. Mr. Beckingham?

BECKINGHAM:

One note that I don't know if the Committee is aware of or if the people are aware of is that when there was a problem with the transportation of hazardous wastes and radioactive materials through the province of New Brunswick, packages were lost and that caused quite a concern and everyone was sort of looking for this contaminated or, I guess, high brightness package somewhere around the Province. So, as it became a concern it seemed like the government had implemented a policy that they would just stop telling people that they were transporting radioactive material and therefore the people would have nothing to worry about. And that's what they do. And that's been adopted since 1983. In this area, you know, I notice that we're getting into a little dog fight over sewage treatment and dumps and we can hit almost every industry, we can hit almost every municipality. We've done it wrong. It's very simple.

I think in your Committee report you should make a note that in northern New Brunswick there have been mistakes made in the past and learning from our mistakes we shall look at the northern part of the Province to make sure what ever they did, that the rest of the Province doesn't do. And then you could have some concrete grounds to come out of here with. Because other than that, we're stuck with it, we live with it, and we'll act accordingly. That's all.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Mr. Beckingham. Are there any other comments? Yes sir?

ALLEN:

I wonder where Mr. Kerr went, I believe...

LAPIERRE:

Mr. Kerr just went out to the washroom, but he's on his way back.

ALLEN:

This question was directed to him.

LAPIERRE:

Mr. Kerr, there's a question for you.

ALLEN:

Mr. Kerr, I believe you're associated with Fraser? I live on the east side of the Fraser Mill and since the new construction or the new modernization of the Atholville Mill, they've built a new stack there, I believe, which is fairly high now compared to the original one that was there, and ever since that has been installed, we have been having a problem with the air in our community. You can taste it. We never did before. You can taste it in the air and smell it. Is there something you can explain to us why we're getting that now. I understand it has to do with the height of the stack.

KERR:

You've got to remember, you place me in a very difficult position. The Environmental Council is composed, as Dr. LaPierre said, of 13 people from across the Province. They represent various interests in the Province. Some are environmentally active, some represent, like Leonard Williams, the farming community, there's representatives of manufacturers. I'm one of those. You're asking me a specific question about Fraser Companies. I can answer that question, but remember I'm not speaking as as member of the Environmental Council. I'm speaking as Vice President of Technology for Fraser.

The old mill gave intermittent air problems approximately once per hour. We rebuilt the mill at a cost of $230 million and we have a chemical recovery system that recovers the cooking base, the magnesia and the sulfur. It runs continuously. It runs 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The smell coming from the mill is continuous.

It is the amount of SO^2 emitted to the atmosphere is in the order of 10% of what it was before but it comes continuously. It does not stop and it depends upon the way the wind blows. We have an air monitoring network on each side of the mill which measures SO^2 continuously. When we started up the mill two years ago, we had a number of violations. Last year we went for nine months without any SO^2 violations. We have to meet ambient air standards set by the Department of Environment in Fredericton. We met them. Last year I think we had three exceedences in the whole year, I'm not sure, Bob Cameron is here and he could correct that. But we are by and large essentially in compliance with the ambient air requirements of the Province.

ALLEN:

I don't mean to be picking on Frasers in that sense, it's just that there have been comments made about different hazardous problems, whether they're air, solid waste or whatever. I was born and raised here and like Mr. MacMillan had said earlier, I used to swim in the Restigouche River just outside of the City of Campbellton here and I don't anymore and neither do my children. And I live even further down the line now than Richardsville. And this problem has been going on for years and I could probably safely say even longer than before the city installed their solid waste site here, we've always had problems. Since I was a young fellow, we've had a mill on both sides of us, one in Dalhousie and one in Atholville. Being a river, the tide goes in and out, we're stuck in the middle and I was just...

LAPIERRE:

OK, well I guess we registered your comments...

KERR:

I can say we are in absolutely complete compliance with the effluent limits. We are putting out in the order of 80% of the biochemical oxygen demand that we did before the mill was rebuilt and the suspended solids from that mill have gone down from in excess of 30 tons per day to 2 tons per day, in the effluent. So, the river below the Atholville mill is in a much better state than it was three years ago.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Well, I guess with that statement we would now thank all of you who have taken time to come out and we welcome the opportunity to listen to your comments. We will do our best to see that your comments are faithfully recorded in our transcript. By the way, once our document is completed, all people who have presented at the meetings will receive a copy of the transcript and of our report.

Thank you very much.